Case 2:14-cv-01166-JMA Document 16 Filed 03/04/15 Page 1 of 62 PageID #: 882

(ase Number 2:14-cv - 61/66 - JM A

Dear Judge agrack,

I am attaching as per your order, a copy of the December 10, 2013 Bankruptcy Court Hearing Transcript.

Lym Schnerder

FILED
IN CLERK'S OFFICE
U.S. DISTRICT COURT E.D.N.Y

★ MAR 04 2015 ★

CC: Gary F. Herbet David Blansky

LONG ISLAND OFFICE

RECEIVED

NIAK U 4 2015

EDNY PRO SE OFFICE

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK Case No. 04-85727 In the Matter of: LYNN CAROL SCHNEIDER, Debtor. U.S. Bankruptcy Court 290 Federal Plaza Central Islip, New York 11722 December 10, 2013 10:21 a.m. BEFORE: JUDGE DOROTHY EISENBERG

```
1
                           PROCEEDINGS
 2
      [10:21:38]
 3
              THE COURT: This is the matter of Lynn Carol
     Schneider.
 4
 5
              MS. SCHNEIDER:
                              I'm Lynn Carl Schneider.
              THE COURT: All right. All right. This is a Motion
 6
 7
     to Compromise.
 8
              I'll hear the appearances. Identify yourselves.
              MISS MASON: Elizabeth Mason. I am an attorney
 9
10
     appearing pro se as the Estate's largest secured creditor and
11
     also as the Estate's, as one of the Estate's administrative
12
     creditors pursuant to Your Honor's Order where I was appointed
     as special, Counsel to the Trustee.
13
14
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
15
              And you are?
16
              MS. SCHNEIDER: Lynn Schneider. I'm the Debtor.
17
              THE COURT: All right.
18
              MR. BLANSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. David
19
     Blansky, Lamonica, Herbst and Maniscalco appearing on behalf of
20
     R. Kenneth Barnard.
21
              And also present, Mr. Barnard is present along with my
22
     partner, Mr. Herbst.
23
              THE COURT: All right. Anyone else?
              MR. PERGAMENT: Good morning. I'm Marc Pergament,
24
25
     Weinberg, Gross and Pergament, Your Honor, Counsel to Long
```

Island Federation, Long Island Forum for Technology.

Also present, Your Honor, is the C.E.O. of the Not-for-Profit corporation and we're here in support of the Trustee's Motion seeking Your Honor's approval of the settlement.

THE COURT: All right.

And I see the U.S. Trustee is represented by Mr. DiMino.

MR. DiMINO: Good morning, Judge.

Alfred DiMino from the Office of the United States
Trustee.

THE COURT: All right. All right.

This is your Motion.

MR. BLANSKY: Yes, Your Honor. Your Honor, probably, little did you imagine five or six years ago that you would find us back before Your Honor in another Motion seeking Court approval.

As the Court may recall, approximately five or six years ago the Trustee proposed a settlement of a different magnitude, \$150,000, which was opposed at the time, not supported by the U.S. Trustee's office and ultimately denied by the Court.

At the time this Court had a number of concerns one of which was ultimately what might the, how might the Debtor benefit from it and, two, what would be down side to the Estate

in terms of cost, expense and delay if the matter were to be pursued further.

If we go back a little bit further in time, the genesis of this case is that this was a case that was re-opened to allow the Trustee to administer this discrimination claim.

That was a claim that had not been disclosed initially but was brought to the Court, the attention of Mr. Barnard at a later date and the case was re-opened for that purpose.

The purpose of this hearing today is not to make light on what the Debtor experienced and what she went through. The point of this hearing is not to criticize the diligence of Ms. Mason in pursuing the underlying award.

The issues we have to deal with in the context of this hearing are whether Mr. Barnard is properly exercising his business judgement in putting this before the Court and how might benefit creditors of the Estate.

Here we have a number of tensions that work. One of them we have to consider the integrity of the bankruptcy system that depends on full and honest disclosures of Debtors.

At the same time we have to be sensitive to the fact that we don't want wrongdoers to get windfalls in circumstances like this because it hurts creditors.

So we have these tensions at issue.

Today before the Court is a settlement that is twice the amount that the Court considered five or six years ago.

Proposed settlement structure for a \$75,000 payment now and quarterly payments of roughly \$28,000.

In the event of non-payment, the settlement provides for Judgement in the principal sum of the award that was made in 2007 together with interest from April of 2007 at nine percent. It is a serious default remedy.

And here the questions become how will it benefit creditors of the Estate and this is where things get a little dicey. What we have before you is objections by the Debtor who failed to disclose the claim and the Trustee's Special Counsel who also indicates that she's Administrative Creditor under her retention and a creditor by virtue of her status as pre-Petition employment Counsel to Ms. Schneider.

None of the unsecured creditors have filed objections to the Motion.

And there's unusual incidents in which Special Counsel to the Trustee has decided to superimpose her judgement or assessment of a settlement over that of the client, Mr. Barnard. In that regard, this is an exceptional case because typically it's Mr. Barnard in his capacity as fiduciary that makes a determination, puts it before the Court for approval. It's usually not subject to the approval of his Special Counsel that had been retained to follow those directives and that's one of the frustrations here.

But more significantly, we think that we've come

before the Court with an award of a very different magnitude that takes into account the, the likelihood of success on the merits, the costs to be incurred among other factors that you typically see in these cases.

Here we're surprised to see in the opposition papers that the estimated amount of Ms. Mason's Administrative Claim has reached \$70,000. She was retained, I believe, in April of 2009 and I know that we had reached the prospective settlement number early in this year and went to sort of a pens down status. So I don't know what, what has been incurred in the more recent months. We've never seen a bill or an invoice but that's not for today.

Ultimately the Court's concern for today is what might be recovered, how might it be disbursed and at the end of the day what might the Debtor see in the event of surplus.

Here I think the settlement is contemplated to provide for funds to the Debtor notwithstanding that there's case law that says that the non-disclosure, partial participation and recovery. This is a Court of equity and I think even the lift, and Mr. Granovi (phonetic) acknowledged that under the facts and circumstances, a settlement should contemplate some benefit to the Debtor under these circumstances even if there might be a scenario under the cases that says she should not participate.

At the end of the day the Court will determine what

fees will be appropriate to Miss Mason, to Trustee's General Counsel, even Trustee's commissions to see whether they're appropriate and give the entire picture on what the Debtor may be entitled to receive under the facts and circumstances.

The single largest claim in the case is, of course, that of Miss Mason. She's filed a claim arising from the charging lien under the Judiciary Law. Under her pre-Petition retainer, that sum is measured by what is actually recovered by settlement or Judgement.

To the extent the Court approves the settlement, that's going to be measured by a third plus her expenses. So if the Court does not then reach, I guess this will continue to prosecute this and whatever comes out at the end of the day will, in terms of the amount of the administrative claim, (inaudible) the number, but, of course, that is going to be subject to your approval as to the value to the Estate, what new work was done, how much work was done after a demarcation line between wherein a settlement posture versus a, the litigation posture. And, of course, what is the continued expense of the Estate to proceed.

I understand from Miss Mason's papers that a briefing deadline for the Estate is arriving, I believe she thought it was approximately the 25th. I think by my calculations it may be the 16th. But it is a near term date.

I imagine there would then be a reply and then

argument before the Second Department at some point next year.

And then, I guess, a determination thereafter at some point.

Here we have a case that, you know, it's the 2004 case and we're still here. I think we've been presented with an opportunity and a double the magnitude that was before the Court before that was one that the Court could not, the Trustee could not lightly disregard and not bring to the Court.

We have a relatively small unsecured creditor body.

That will certainly benefit them. And depending on the outcome of the proof of the settlement and how the Court perceives the professional fees, there should be money here leftover for the benefit of the Debtor.

And so for these reasons we think that we do meet the test for the approval of the settlement and that the Trustee has appropriately exercised in his business judgement under the circumstances. They're not easy ones but I think they're appropriate ones.

THE COURT: Which, which creditors remain?

MR. BLANSKY: Your Honor, I believe it's an assortment of small unsecured creditors. We have --

THE COURT: Other, other than Miss Mason.

MR. BLANSKY: Right. We have -- Well, we have G.E.

Money which is a small Claimant. We have a Discover Bank,

probably the single largest unsecured for \$18,000. We have

Capital One for a small sum of money. The single largest claim

```
1
      seems to be a credit card and then two smaller credit cards.
      The rest would -- The rest on the filed docket would have been
 2
     the administrative claims at the time that she had proposed the
 3
 4
     Chapter 13.
 5
              So it's roughly $40,000 of unsecured debt.
              THE COURT: Okay. That's what I wanted to know.
 6
 7
     Approximately $40,000.
 8
              MR. BLANSKY: $40,000 to $42,000 but I believe one of
 9
     the claims is actually an amendment to an earlier claim for
     $1,500 and once addressed it would change the claim some --
10
11
              THE COURT: Okay.
12
              MR. BLANSKY: -- but you're talking about the $40,000
13
     of true unsecured debt.
14
              THE COURT: All right. Is that your presentation,
     Sir?
15
16
              MR. BLANSKY: Yes, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: All right. Anyone else wish to be heard?
17
              MISS MASON: Your Honor --
18
19
              THE COURT: Yes.
              MISS MASON: -- I would like to be heard.
20
              THE COURT: Yes.
21
22
              MISS MASON: Thank you.
              I'm appearing as pro se attorney with the largest
23
     secured claim of the Estate.
24
              Presently my secured claim is valued at $234,000.
25
```

also have an administrative claim that is currently valued at 1 \$70,000. Together that's more than \$300,000 in legal fees. 2 3 I should add, Your Honor, that I have been representing Ms. Schneider in this case or I should be handling 4 5 this case the last thirteen years of my life and I have received not one penny for that representation. 6 7 My compensation is going to be entirely dependent upon 8 the success of my enforcing a damage award that is now worth 9 approximately \$700,000. THE COURT: How do you arrive at that because I have 10 11 looked at the Trustee's figures and he didn't come up to that 12 number at all. 13 MISS MASON: That's your -- That's correct. 14 that's one of the main reasons of many why we oppose the Trustee's --15 16 THE COURT: Well, tell me how you arrive at your 17 number. 18 MISS MASON: My Exhibit A to my papers sets forth the itemization by which I arrived at that figure. 19 THE COURT: Well, what, what happens if you proceed 20 and the Court goes the other way and says that there should not 21 22 be any award? MISS MASON: That's, that's a good question, Your 23 Honor and I, I feel I, I have personal knowledge that can 24 25 answer that question.

There is two issues here. The first issue is that the State Appellate Court has already ruled in our favor that the Trustee has standing to file this claim and collect this claim. That is no longer an issue that is on the table.

THE COURT: Is this an appeal?

MISS MASON: There is no appeal of that. There was no appeal. The decision was rendered in 2012. It's my Exhibit D. and that decision expressly states that the Trustee, pursuant to comedy, principals of comedy, is permitted to collect and enforce this award as is the division of human rights.

The second ground upon which L.I.F.T. is seeking to appeal this award is the merits of the award. Now the merits of the award have already passed through several layers of review. The Division of Human Rights is the entity that came up with this award and it rendered this award in a thirty-six page decision. That decision has been provided to Your Honor as well. It's also a part of Exhibit B.

Now on review, there's a very difficult standard that would have to be met by L.I.F.T. to demonstrate that this award should be vacated because this, the Appellate Court's recognize that the Commissioner of the Division of Human Rights is in the best position to assess the merits and the damages of this case.

I was before that Second Department Appellate Court back in 2010. They had read the, the L.I.S.T. brief and they

stated in the bench to both L.I.S.T. Counsel and myself that they felt that this was a very strong case of discrimination and retaliation.

I am resting my entire fee on the successfulness of my obtaining the enforcement of this award on appeal. I surely believe that because I'm the only secured creditor that has anything to risk, I would be in the best position to make the assessment as to the merits of this decision. I have the most to lose if this Court were to grant today's proposal and I have everything to win if this Court were to reject it.

I can state having been practicing in employment litigation for the last approximately twenty-three years of my career, and that is my sole practice, employment discrimination, that I am in, perhaps, the best position as it relates to the Trustee or myself as to assess the merits of this case. And it is my professional opinion that the merits warrant enforcement of the award.

If this award is allowed to be enforced, there is continuing statutory interest that accrues at the rate of nine percent until it's paid in full. There is a very, very slim likelihood that they would ever appeal it to the higher Court if they were to lose because they would have to post a bond worth approximately \$700,000. Previously in papers filed with this Court, they said they would never, they could not post a bond as a non-profit.

I have also provided the Court with tax returns filed by L.I.F.T. which are public because it's a non-profit organization which demonstrate that it has generated income on its own in the seven figures every year for the last, you know, three or four years.

This is a viable, successful organization that fully has the capability of paying this Judgement. And until it's paid, the Estate is going to generate nine percent interest on this Judgement. So every day, every week, every month that goes by, more money comes in to the Estate which can benefit the Debtor because she's going to be the one who is going to be recovering after everybody else is paid.

Now I would like to point out that the only entity that is not here are any of the unsecured creditors who, whose claims only amount to \$40,000.

THE COURT: Which leads me to believe you're arguing on behalf of your client.

MISS MASON: I am -- Well, actually, Your Honor, I am, I think I can present an argument as why my, my position is going to also benefit the unsecured creditors as well as the Debtor. And the reason why I say that is as follows:

I have what's called a -- I have two claims, a secured claim as a, as a attorney holding a statutory claim for legal fees. The law is very clear that when an attorney handles a case in New York, their legal fees is protected by a

```
1
               And that statute is near, Judiciary Law 475.
 2
     Bankruptcy Code is not permitted to compromise that statute.
 3
     The law is very clear and I have numerous cases demonstrating
     that to be the case. If you would like the sites, I can give
 4
 5
     them to you.
 6
              Because of that, that lien regarding my legal fees
 7
     came into effect the moment I entered the case to represent Ms.
 8
     Schneider back in 2000. So, therefore, right now when I filed
     my initial lien for attorneys fees in 2008, I think it was,
 9
10
     those fees were protected and could not be compromised by the
11
     Trustee because they were considered to be a --
              THE COURT: We're not dealing with the fees now.
12
13
              MISS MASON: Okay.
              THE COURT:
                          I'm trying to determine --
14
15
              MISS MASON: Okay.
              THE COURT: -- whether, whether I should approve this
16
     proposed settlement and you're telling me that your fees are
17
18
     protected.
              MISS MASON: Okay.
19
                          That doesn't answer it.
20
              THE COURT:
              MISS MASON: All right. I'll get to the point.
21
              So if you satisfy my liens, my fees which right now,
22
     and I, I understand it's to the Court's discretion to determine
23
     what's a reasonable fee and what's not a reasonable fee.
24
     now my fees are approximately $300,000. All right.
                                                           That --
25
```

THE COURT: I, I get it that you, you --

MISS MASON: So --

THE COURT: -- are seeking to protect your fees. Why should I not approve in the bankruptcy case the proposed settlement?

MISS MASON: Because to -- If my fees are protected, you take \$300,000 off of, of what's being established today as the, the proposed settlement which is \$300,000. That does not address other administrator claims. It does not address the Trustee's fees.

If you take those fees, which the Trustee did not provide in his papers, we have no idea what he intends to deduct from that \$300,000, in addition to which there are liens that potentially also exist for Medicaid and other benefits the Debtor, the Debtor has obtained.

That leaves nothing to satisfy the \$40,000 in unsecured creditors and it leaves nothing for the Debtor whereas, Your Honor, if you were to allow me to continue to collect this award, which you ordered that to happen four years ago pursuant to your Order to appoint me as Special Trustee to the, to the Trustee, Special Counsel to the Trustee, excuse me, we would potentially have a \$700,000 award. I would take my portion of it. The administrator claims would be paid in full. The unsecured creditors claims would be paid in full. And the Debtor would, would receive the balance —

```
THE COURT: I've heard that. I, I hear you.
 1
 2
               MISS MASON: Okav.
 3
               THE COURT: Now tell me what about the merits of the
      objection by, on, on behalf of L.I.F.T. and Cordani.
 4
 5
              MISS MASON: I would submit, Your Honor, that there
 6
     were, there was virtually nothing in their papers that
 7
     demonstrated the merits supporting the compromise of this
     damage award. They speak about this lack of jurisdiction issue
 8
 9
     which I've already demonstrated has been fully decided in the
     Trustee's favor. That's not an issue. So that argument is off
10
11
     the table.
12
              The only other issue is whether or not the case will
13
     be, the, the damage award will be upheld on appeal. And as
14
     I've stated, there's every reason for me to expect that it
15
     would based on the, the Court's statements to Counsel during
16
     our oral argument, based on my appellate brief which I've
17
     already filed previously and I've addressed all the law and I'm
     familiar with the law.
18
19
              So -- And then the only other issue was they said
     collectability but I've already demonstrated that their
20
     collectability argument is also vacuous because of the fact
21
     that their tax returns full reflect the ability to generate
22
     income and pay this award until it's satisfied.
23
24
              THE COURT: Well, the last few years they didn't have
```

very much --

```
1
               MISS MASON: I'm sorry, Your Honor?
 2
               THE COURT: In the last few years based on the tax
      returns that were filed, there wasn't that much in income over
 3
 4
      and above their expenses.
 5
              MISS MASON:
                          They have, in 2011 they put --
 6
              THE COURT: How about 2012?
 7
              MISS MASON: They don't have -- They --
                                                         Those tax
 8
     returns have not been provided.
 9
              THE COURT:
                          All right. Just 2011?
10
              MISS MASON: Yes, Your Honor.
11
              THE COURT: And what is that?
12
              MISS MASON: And for 2011 they earned outside of fund
13
     money, $2 million in addition to which they --
14
              THE COURT: Well, what was, what was left after
15
     expenses?
              MISS MASON: Well, they have on their books, they put
16
     on their books this damage award so after accounting for this
17
     damage award on their books, they have $150,000 left.
18
              And Judgements can be satisfied for twenty years.
19
     here we have the best security. We have nine percent interest
20
     accruing. They have every incentive to pay this Judgement
21
     immediately. They can take out a loan, you know, and, and pay
22
23
     it.
24
              The bottom line is, they have the means to pay it and
     that's something that can be paid over -- The longer it takes
25
```

```
1
     for them to pay it, the better the Debtor is.
 2
              THE COURT: All right.
 3
              MISS MASON: Thank you, Your Honor.
              THE COURT:
                          All right. Anyone else wish to be heard?
 4
 5
              MR. PERGAMENT:
                              Yes, Your Honor.
 6
              MS. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
 7
              MR. PERGAMENT: If I may.
              MS. SCHNEIDER: I have --
 8
 9
              THE COURT: All right.
10
              MR. PERGAMENT: Your Honor, I think the Debtor wants
11
     to be heard.
12
              THE COURT: All right. I'll hear from the Debtor.
13
              MR. PERGAMENT: Because I'm standing in support of the
14
     application so let's hear the objection.
15
              MS. SCHNEIDER: Hi, Your Honor. I wanted to object to
16
     the, to the Trustee's motion because once my creditors are paid
     then there won't be anything left for me and I know I made a
17
18
     mistake and I explained to you last time about the asset
     because I couldn't afford to have an attorney so I filed pro se
19
20
     and I did make a mistake.
              THE COURT: Well, when you decided to act pro se,
21
22
     there is a question that asks whether you have any claim.
              MS. SCHNEIDER: Well, it said do you have -- It says,
23
     do you have any assets and I hadn't gone to, I hadn't won at
24
     that point and when I went to college an asset to me when I
25
```

went for my Masters is an asset is something you hold in your hand. An asset is money. And I hadn't gone to Court yet. So I didn't know if I was going to win or not.

So that's -- And when I went to go with the pro se office, they don't answer any legal questions for you. They just say, you have to ask an attorney. And when you don't have an attorney to ask questions for that, you get messed up like I did. And I apologized a million times for this and I, I am sorry. I didn't do anything to, to mess this up because I really didn't want to do that. I didn't want to hide anything from anybody and I said right away when they asked about the bankruptcy, I told you.

But I, I just want the opportunity again to say I, I apologize. You know, I just, I just want the opportunity to, to go after my entire Judgement because I want to be able to pay off my creditors, I want to pay off Elizabeth for the, you know, for representing me. And I want to just start a new life.

And I just want L.I.F.T., because L.I.F.T. and, and Dick Cordani and, and Walter Mickel (phonetic), they should pay what they did to me. They really ruined my life and it's seventeen years, Your Honor. It, it's seventeen years and I just want them to be accountable, held accountable because to me this feels like, going back and forth like this, it's a joke and my life is not a joke. And I just want them to be held

accountable because they did this to me and just because I made a mistake, I don't want this to be just because I made a mistake.

I stood up for what I did wrong and I told you what I did wrong. Now it's their turn to stand up for what they did wrong.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. PERGAMENT: Good morning, Your Honor.

On, on behalf of Long Island Forum for Technology, Your Honor, I want to address several points with respect to the Trustee's Motion and we also have Special Counsel who is familiar with what transpired with the Appellate Division so we'll have Counsel explain that to Your Honor about the merits of the claim and what the Appellate Division said or did not say because I believe Your Honor was given misinformation.

Several points, Your Honor. First of all, Ms. Mason repeats something several times. The more you repeat it, it doesn't make it true. She is not a secured creditor. She is entitled to a third of the amount recovered.

Right now the recovery is zero. If the Trustee recovers \$300,000, she gets a third of \$300,000. It's \$100,000. She doesn't get a third of \$700,000.

Number two, her so called administrative claim, Judge, was the manufactured administrative claim because, and Mr. Blansky is much more polite and nicer than I am, we were trying

to settle this matter. We were extending the time to file the brief in the Appellate Division. Mr. Barnard, through Counsel, agreed to extend that time so that my client would not have to incur the expense of doing a brief. And Miss Mason would not have to spend the time doing that while we're trying to work out a settlement.

Despite explicit direction by the Trustee, Miss Mason opposed the extension of time to file the brief. I've never had it. Your Honor, if I was a Trustee and a Special Counsel did that to me, that Special Counsel would not have been my Counsel anymore. But Mr. Barnard put it aside, let's deal with the merits.

So she (inaudible) and did what her client told her. That is her client. Miss Mason doesn't do what Ms. Schneider tells her to do. She has to do what Mr. Barnard has to, tells her to do.

Number two, Your Honor -- So there's \$70,000 in expenses. Your Honor, I believe it's just make believe.

Okay. But that will be dealt with by Your Honor down the road.

If the award of -- If the settlement of \$300,000 is approved, Miss Mason will get \$100,000. The Trustee would get his commissions on \$300,000 which Your Honor is aware is approximately \$17,000. Mr. Lamonica's firm, Lamonica and Maniscalco, will get its legal fees subject to, of course, a hearing before Your Honor. And the unsecured creditors get

1.3

paid in full and the money left over, which will be substantial, goes to Ms. Schneider.

So Ms. Schneider does get a fresh start even though she did not answer Your Honor's question. The bankruptcy form says, do you have any claimed or law suits that you could pursue? It doesn't say, give me the assets. It says, do you have any claims or law suits.

And Your Honor was fully aware of what that (inaudible). She purposely said no. and what happened was when she was going to lose the case, she came to Court and said, oh, I forgot, I forgot to list this law suit. So she knew what she was doing then. She got caught and said, oh, my mistake. And then she did answer Your Honor's question as to why she didn't list the asset because it's not an asset, it's within the sub-category of claims and that's what the form is.

And Your Honor who conducted more 341 meetings than I would want to count, one of the questions Your Honor asks is, do you have any claims or law suits that you could pursue or the trustee could pursue on your behalf? That is a standard question at 341 meetings Your Honor conducted years ago that Mr. Barnard still conducts today. And the answer of the Debtor was no.

So she misrepresented at 341 meeting and continued that misrepresentation.

With respect to Miss Mason's argument that there's all

this revenue that you can collect this Judgement, first of all, Your Honor, she's mistaken. You could appeal to the Court of Appeals without filing a bond. The Judgement could be enforced unless the Court of Appeals says it should be stayed.

Number two, as Your Honor zeroed in correctly, there is minimal available assets of Long Island Forum and Technology. It is a non-for-profit. Its assets are effectively its equipment and its revenue is either donations or grants that come from government agencies that are what we call restricted grants. What does that mean? That means the funds have to be used to specified purposes. It cannot be used for certain expenses. It cannot be used for liabilities.

So at the end of the day even if Your Honor did not approve the settlement and even if the Appellate Division affirms the award of the administrative agency, it's not a trial, it's an administrative agency, and the Court of Appeals does not reverse, the Trustee then tries to pursue this Judgement.

Well, Long Island Forum of Technology has about \$75,000 in its bank account. That's not going to pay a \$700,000 award. So at the end of the day who gets hurt here is actually your creditors. They get nothing because that money gets gobbled up in Miss Mason's fees.

And, as Your Honor is aware, it is hard to predict as a Trustee what an Appellate Court will do especially we're

talking about a trial before the State Supreme Court. There was an administrative hearing that went on for years, years and Counsel will explain to Your Honor a lot of the problems with that administrative hearing. It's not as though my client wanted to settle for \$300,000.

We considered the risk. Mr. Barnard considered the risk. And we weighed the risk of a reversal by the Appellate Division versus a risk of course of an affirmance and had considered collectability. We provided Mr. Barnard what financially he requested in addition to the public documents that he had. He reviewed that with his Counsel, very expert Counsel, Your Honor, we're not talking about Trustee's Counsel who are inexperienced in these kind of matters, Your Honor, and we negotiated hard.

We did not offer \$300,000 in the beginning. We went back and forth, Your Honor, and we ultimately agreed on that amount and because of my client's financial position, we need several years to pay it back. That tells you that my client is not awash with cash. Gross revenues is not money in the bank. That just means the money comes in and has to pay expenses, payroll, rent, etcetera and I think Your Honor recognized that and Miss Mason really did not answer Your Honor's question because the tax returns show the amount in the bank for all the years, if you go back all these years, there's less than \$100,000 a year.

This is basically a not-for-profit that brings in money, pays the expenses, serves the public and that's what it does. It doesn't reward anybody else. There's no dividends. That's why it's a not-for-profit.

And I think Your Honor, based on the facts before Your Honor and the facts that Miss Mason just, really is just making up arguments, there is no real objection of any merit to the Trustee's application. And I believe Your Honor should grant the application and approve the settlement.

THE COURT: All right. Anyone else wish to be heard?

MR. WENGER I would like to be heard if I may, Your

Honor.

THE COURT: Yes. Identify yourself and tell me who you represent.

MR. WENGER My name is Mark Wenger. I'm with the law firm Jackson Lewis PC and I represent the Long Island Forum for Technology and I rise in support of the proposed settlement.

There have been some comments in this proceeding with respect to the merits of the underlying claim and the appeal proceedings. I am the attorney representing L.I.F.T., and Mr. Cordani as well, the individual Defendant who has been dragged through this process for these many years, and I am in a position to comment on the status of those proceedings, how they've come to this point and where they're likely to go.

There have been some representations about what's

happened previously and what the Appellate Division panel apparently commented on about the merits of the claim. I am here to tell you what was said. It was definitely not what the Appellate Division said about the case.

They made a determination on our initial appeal from the award of the State Division of Human Rights that the individual Debtor did not have the capacity to pursue that claim. That is the only issue that they decided. They did not opine on the merits of the claim. They remanded the matter to the Division of Human Rights for substitution of the Trustee. The Division of Human Rights then confirmed the original award and we've now taken an appeal on numerous grounds, many of which we asserted in our original appeal.

But there is, there are a slew of issues any one of which could render the State Divisions award annulity and there is a, in my opinion, and I've been litigating employment discrimination cases for twenty-six years to the extent that that's relevant, there is a substantial likelihood that the award is either vacated or that it is reduced, possibly as much as by half.

Even if the Debtor wins on the merits of the award, she may recover something less than \$400,000 and I would be happy to explain how that could happen.

THE COURT: Yeah. Why don't you do that.

MR. WENGER Sure. There are a number of elements of

damages in this award. Primarily among them are back pay. The Debtor was an employee of L.I.F.T., she claimed that she was subjected to sexual harassment, that she complained and that at some point she was terminated and that was in retaliation for her complaints.

But one of the elements of damages that she's claiming and that the Division of Human Rights awarded her was back pay. It is our contention that the back pay award is, even if you were, even you sustain the merits, and I certainly disagree with that and I think the standard of review on appeal has been mischaracterized and that there is a, the Division of Human Rights awards are reversed on appeal all the time and this is a prime candidate for it, but leave aside the merits of the sexual harassment and retaliation claim.

Back pay award, she was, she was employed I think up until 1996 or 1997. She's, yeah, claiming back pay for several years and then nine percent interest on top of that. She has an obligation to mitigate her damages. The record is replete with evidence that she failed to meet her obligation to mitigate her damages. The Division of Human Rights made no comment on that issue. We believe that on, on appeal the Appellate Division will examine that issue and they may well conclude that if she's entitled to any back pay, it will be for a brief period of time until she failed to meet her mitigation obligations.

We also believe that the interest calculations are wildly overstated. They've ran -- The, the Division of Human Rights is running interest from 2000. A hearing was not commenced in this proceeding until 2004. Now that's almost eight years after the, the Debtor was terminated. We believe that the Division of Human Rights delay should not be assessed against L.I.F.T. Nine percent interest shouldn't run during that time. It was not through any fault of L.I.F.T. that the proceeding was delayed for that length of time.

And then on top of that, the Debtor ignores her obligations to schedule this administrative claim as an asset causing further delay and apparently now benefiting from the nine percent interest that runs during that delay. We believe that all of those issues will be addressed by the Appellate Division and when they do, that they will substantially reduce the award.

There are other elements of damages as well.

Compensatory damages for example, basically emotional distress damages. There was no medical evidence produced during this hearing regarding her emotional distress and yet the Division of Human Rights awarded \$75,000 for emotional distress. We believe the case law is clear that that's an excessive award. Interest should not run on top of that award in any event. But that amount should be reduced substantially.

There are, there are other issues I think that we've

raised with respect to the appeal and the calculation of damages.

All-in-all I think if she wins, there is a considerable likelihood if she wins on the merits that she walks away with less than \$400,000.

Now, as to the merits, we also believe that since her claims are two-fold, harassment and then retaliation.

The harassment claim doesn't justify back pay. One doesn't get back pay simply because one was exposed to severe, pervasive and offensive conduct. She has to establish some direct damage. That's the emotional distress award.

The retaliation claim we believe is particularly susceptible to being reversed on appeal because the evidence on the complaints was remote in time from her actual termination. The individual to whom the complaints were made was not a decision maker. These issues could result in the, the Appellate Division concluding that while there may have been harassment, that is an issue for the Division and they might defer to the Division's discretion on that.

As a matter of law, a complaint that's remote in time to the adverse action, the termination decision, is not retaliation. There's no tempo of proximity. That is an issue the Appellate Division will have to address. If they conclude that the retaliation claim is legally invalid, there's no back pay award whatsoever and that, that, that makes an enormous

difference in the total amount of the award.

So for all of those reasons we think that there is, there is a chance that the appeal will be successful and that L.I.F.T. will be exonerated and Mr. Cordani will be exonerated. And that even if not, that the award will be substantially less than what the Claimant is, is seeking.

And for those reasons we feel that a \$300,000 settlement is more than sufficient to address any viable claims that she might have and it's a reasonable settlement under the circumstances.

THE COURT: All right. Anyone else wish to be heard?
All right.

MISS MASON: Your Honor, the law is very clear. I am a secured creditor. The Trustee has previously recognized it as such and I can provide fifteen cases that state that I am.

THE COURT: We're not here to discuss your fees.

MISS MASON: Okay. I just want to address that point.

I, I, I understand that.

The second point is that in terms of the merits of this case, I have provided Your Honor with a copy of that decision that Your Honor previously read and reviewed as did the U.S. Trustee and found that it was a very strong case as you perceived it and as the U.S. Trustees perceived it and as I have perceived it and the head of the Division of Human Rights has perceived it.

My client was sexually harassed by a co-worker and she complained not once, not twice --

THE COURT: Well, how, how about some of the issues now being raised that would come up before the Division should it have to have a hearing?

MISS MASON: I'm, I'm -- Those issues being that there are no merits to their appeal. I have already drafted the reply brief. I have already pulled the law. I have every single point that they raised, I have law showing there's no basis for it. Statutory fees for instance, okay, statutory interest, there is Court of Appeal law that says it was an abuse of discretion not to award statutory interest. There's not a single case on the books that supports vacating statutory interest. Not a single one that would, that in this situation would ever be --

THE COURT: How about mitigation?

MISS MASON: I'm glad you brought up that up, Your
Honor, because on Page 20 of the Division's decision, which is
Exhibit B, the Division fully addresses her mitigation efforts.
In fact, she mitigated more than \$200,000 worth of salary in
her mitigation efforts. She was constantly e-mailing, reading
the paper, contacting friends. On three separate occasions
because of her mitigation efforts she got jobs, temporary jobs,
jobs through colleagues of hers, through friends, through the
State. So she mitigated and the law is very clear that unless

you --

THE COURT: Has there been a determination as to that issue?

MISS MASON: By the Division of Human Rights there has been that she mitigated. And the law is clear, that unless you, if you remove yourself from the job market, which she did not do, okay, if you reject a job offer, which she did not do, and, and if you take a different position outside of your area of expertise, which she did not do, those are where you show failure to mitigate. So the --

If you look at Page 20 through 24 and then even further in terms of the law, it's very clear that she mitigated. And she mitigated so well that she reduced her back pay damages by more than \$200,000.

I'm the attorney who was present at the hearing and I handled this hearing. Counsel was not there. Former Counsel for L.I.F.T. was discharged and this Counsel came in long after the hearing was over. So I'm the attorney who knows the evidence that was presented in favor of the Plaintiff showing sexual harassment, showing retaliation.

THE COURT: I'm sure there is a record that -MISS MASON: There is and it, it's this long and it's
before the Appellate Court.

And, furthermore, I would like to point out that if L.I.F.T. is so certain that it's going to receive zero, you

```
know, as a, as a Judgement, then L.I.F.T. should be all for our
1
2
    going back to the Appellate Court on appeal because frankly
    L.I.F.T. does have everything to lose. It's going to. It's
3
    looking at a $700,000 judgement against it. That's why
    L.I.F.T. wants to compromise this claim for less than half of
    its value.
             And I need just to emphasize, Your Honor, the two most
    important entities that are relevant to this Court's decision,
    i.e. the interest of the, the, the creditors and the debtor are
    vehemently opposed to this compromise.
             THE COURT: All right. I hear that. Thank you.
             MISS MASON: Thank you, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Where is the Trustee? Did you want to
    respond to her?
            MR. WENGER I would like to address some of these
    comments --
             THE COURT:
                        Yes.
            MR. WENGER -- if I may briefly, Your Honor.
                        Go ahead.
            THE COURT:
            MR. WENGER There is a record. We've examined the
   record very closely and we've made that the basis for our
   appeal.
            On the issue of mitigation for example, if she's
   mitigated her damages, she should not continue to receive a
   back pay award and yet the Division of Human Rights, contrary
```

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to the evidence in the record we believe, allowed her back pay award to continue to run after she obtained what was described as temporary employment. She has some self-employment, she received some income, she had project based employment, she had temporary employment. She had lengthy periods of unemployment during which she was making no efforts to find other work. And throughout that entire period of time, for almost eight and a half years, the Division of Human Rights continued to run the clock on her back pay award.

It's our view that the case law is clear. That record will not justify a back pay award.

We also believe on the issue of statutory interest, for example, we're not contesting the issue of applying interest to an Order. That goes without saying. What we're contesting on the appeal and what we believe we have good grounds to reverse is the date of approval. The date of approval selected by the Division of Human Rights is some time in 2000 and because of the delay of the Division of Human Rights and frankly the delay caused by the Debtor's failure to list the asset on her schedule, L.I.F.T. should not be assessed nine percent interest during that entire time period. There is ample case law on that issue.

So I think that that warrants the Court's consideration and the -- I stand by my representation that the award, even if they're successful on the merits, would be

substantially reduced from what it is. 1 2 Thank you. THE COURT: All right. I'll hear from the Trustee. 3 MR. BARNARD: Your Honor --4 THE COURT: Identify yourself. 5 MR. BARNARD: Yes. R. Kenneth Barnard, Chapter 7 6 7 Trustee. Your Honor, this is a ten year old case. At some 8 9 point this needs to come to a conclusion. We, we are looking at a situation where we have a substantial offer. We have a 10 Defendant represented well by Counsel who has presented a 11 variety of very good defenses with respect to the merits of the 12 claim. 13 14 We have a situation where we, where our ultimate reward may be no better than the settlement being offered at 15 the moment. 16 We have a situation where we certainly could lose on 17 appeal and end up with nothing after ten years. 18 From the fiduciary standpoint as to the creditors, 19 it's one hundred percent recovery so shall I turn that down and 20 roll the dice instead on the possibility of, of a, a better 21 recovery that increases the surplus? 22 In terms of how the money is ultimately divided, Your 23 Honor has control over that. Your Honor has control over what 24 fees are going to be awarded here and how the money is 25

ultimately going to be divided and it appears to me from, from the, from the numbers that there will be a substantial surplus to the Debtor here and that's a good thing, I think.

We have, as Mr., Mr. Pergament said before, negotiated hard. They didn't volunteer \$300,000, Your Honor. Your Honor, these -- After substantial negotiations we have gotten to what appears to me to be a very reasonable number under the circumstances and in the face of this litigation. And as I see the litigation, this could go on many, many more years. We -- The appeal hasn't been argued yet. It could be remanded for further hearings. We could find ourselves standing here three, four years from now once again.

So, again, given a reasonable recovery, a reasonable surplus to the Debtor, she will get her opportunity for a fresh start. Her, her creditors will be paid. She will leave here with some surplus money. She gets her fresh start. It seems to me that that's the best outcome that could be achieved under the circumstances and, again, Your Honor, we've given this substantial time.

We were here five years ago. Shall we come back in another five years? It, it -- We reach a point, Your Honor, where the distribution to creditors will, will be meaningless and will be so far from the event.

So at this point I recommend that the Court accept the settlement.

```
THE COURT: I, I take it that's your genuine business
1
2
     decision?
              MR. BARNARD: Yes, Your Honor. Yes, Your Honor.
 3
     Given the defenses that are being presented, the posture of the
 4
     case, the potential recovery to the unsecured creditors and the
 5
     potential realitible surplus to the Debtor, I think it is a
 6
     reasonable business decision to recommend that the settlement
7
     go forward.
8
              THE COURT: All right. Is, is this timely? In other
 9
     words, is there still an opportunity to oppose it in the State,
10
     in the Appellate Division?
11
              MR. BARNARD: Yes. My understanding is that the
12
     Defendant has filed their brief and that if it is not approved
13
     today, what will happen next is brief will be submitted on
14
     behalf of the Plaintiff, the appeal will be argued and then
15
     whatever will flow from that.
16
              THE COURT: So it's timely. It's not --
17
              MR. BARNARD: Correct.
18
              THE COURT: It's not out of time.
19
              MR. BARNARD: Correct.
20
              THE COURT: And one more question to you, Sir.
21
              MR. BARNARD: Yes.
22
              THE COURT: I notice in your papers that you have
23
     indicated that at most the recovery would be approximately
24
25
     $493,000 or $500,000.
```

```
MR. BARNARD: We, we had a different calculation with
respect to the interest than they, than they did. We -- I, I
-- You know, we've read the papers and it's just a difference
of opinion. And Mr. Blansky can explain the calculation much
clearer than I.
         THE COURT: Well, I would like to know what you think
the ultimate, at best what it might be. Does anyone have that
        MR. BARNARD: The best case scenario.
        THE COURT: The best case scenario so I'll know what
the settlement is against what is possible.
        MR. BLANSKY: Your Honor, I believe we, that
calculation came from using the final Order --
        THE COURT: Yes.
        MR. BLANSKY: -- from April of '07 and then we did the
calculation using the nine percent from that date forward and
that's how we got the, got the number as to the date of the
papers.
        THE COURT: All right.
        MR. BLANSKY: As close to I think the, the 2000 or
2004 calculation that I think you've heard discussed or put
into various calculations. That why we have a smaller --
        THE COURT: Well, is there any, is there any support
for a $700,000 claim?
        MR. BARNARD: Your Honor, I've heard the defenses that
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

are presented. It seems to me they, you know, the defenses have merit in that respect. The \$700,000 number doesn't seem like a true number to me from my reading, in my, in my opinion from my reading of the documents.

THE COURT: All right. All right.

MR. PERGAMENT: Your Honor, if I may just --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. PERGAMENT: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I just want to clarify two points.

Number one, Your Honor, with respect to the Appellate Division, you asked about timeliness.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. PERGAMENT: Just so Your Honor is aware of the, of the process in the Appellate Division, once the appeal is fully briefed it then is about six or eight months from now will be placed on the Appellate Division calendar. The Appellate Division right now in the Second Department is rendering decisions twelve to eighteen months from whence on its calendar which means we're talking about roughly two years from now and that's assuming, Your Honor, that, of course, there's not a reversal or a remand.

Number two, Your Honor, an issue that Mr. Barnard eluded to but be clear, the other factor here in the settlement was not just we believe \$700,000 is out of whack because the issue of collectability which Mr. Blansky and I and Mr. Herbst

and I and, of course, with the Trustee spent a lot of time,
Your Honor, where they had to make a judgement, the judgement
that I had made, that collectability is really an issue here.

And here we are insuring that the creditors get one hundred cents on a dollar. Your Honor, that is an important consideration. When you act as Trustee you always run the risk of collectability when you're in any lawsuit. And here especially in talking about deminimous which, obviously, is not an entity that has a lot of hard assets for the benefit of creditors. And thus the settlement I believe is in the interest of the Estate which would be the unsecured creditors and, of course, that's the business judgement to Mr. Barnard who is a very experienced Trustee and represented by very experienced bankruptcy and Trustee Counsel.

And I ask Your Honor to grant the motion in its entirety.

THE COURT: All right. Did you have something you wanted to --

MISS MASON: In response, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MISS MASON: Thank you. I think it's noteworthy to the Court to see exactly the basis upon which the Trustee is asking the Court to compromise a damage award by more than \$400,000 worth of that award.

The Trustee has not provided any statement regarding

the accrued interest in its papers.

1.5

I have provided detailed calculations and they're very simple and I provided that to Your Honor as Exhibit A. The Trustee has not demonstrate that Exhibit A's numbers are incorrect.

THE COURT: Well, would it matter if it were \$1 million but it was attempted to be settled and the settlement might be in the best interest of creditors?

MISS MASON: The settlement is not in the best interest certainly of me because you're compromising my claim from \$300,000 to \$100,000. So I would be losing over two-thirds of my legal fees. So I would be seriously damaged by this compromise. And I as the State's largest secured creditor have the largest interest here at stake in addition to which I submitted to Your Honor forty-nine points demonstrating that this compromise fails to satisfy the Supreme Court and the Second Circuit Court's test as to whether it's reasonable or not. I itemized each of these seven points in my objections and I would ask Your Honor to review my objections to see that there is no reasonableness to this proposed offer.

The, the Trustee has failed to satisfy his burden. It was his burden to demonstrate that it's fair and reasonable and in the best interest of the creditors. And I, as the creditor, say it's not in my best interest.

The Debtor has said it's not in her best interest.

So because of what's been submitted and argued, there's no basis to conclude that it's in the best interest of this Estate.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. DiMino, did you wish to be heard?

MR. DiMINO: Thank you, Judge. Alfred DiMino for the Office of the United States Trustee.

As the Court recalled, we were here once before on a potential settlement of about half the amount that's being offered today. At that time in that status of the case back then was the pending determination of whether or not the Debtor would even be able to continue with his claim because it hadn't been listed as an asset on her bankruptcy case.

And obviously since then the decision has been made that the Trustee could be substituted in and, and, and go forward. And there was a determination in terms of the underlying causes of action.

But the case remains in flux. There is still an appeal. The appeal now is rather than from the procedural aspect of whether or not the case should be dismissed because of an improper Plaintiff. We now have the merits going up on appeal and that has not been determined.

The, the two issues that I, that I see, and I do appreciate Counsel's arguments because there are some economics involved for everyone that would be somewhat compromised by the

1.5

approval of, of the settlement.

But the two things that exist today that are at least to some extent more clear is that the Court has to determine whether or not, one, the amount is reasonable given the overall claims, whether or not the Trustee is exercising his business judgement appropriately.

And, and the two major issues are, one, there is risk inherent with any appeal. There's a risk of a loss by the, by the, the party in terms of, of the party who obtained the Judgement is a risk that that Judgement could be overturned. There's a risk that that Judgement could be reduced.

Secondly, there's a risk of collectability. I have no reason to doubt the Trustees conclusion that collectability may have some issues. I won't say I know all of the financial circumstances of the Defendants but there is a concern and the Trustee has to take that into consideration when determining whether or not a settlement is reasonable.

So at, at this point it appears that the Court could find that the Trustee is exercising his, his judgement appropriately based upon those two issues.

It would be, it would be obviously preferable to everyone if the entire amount was sustained, that, that everybody gets paid, everybody goes home, everybody gets their money but that may not be the case.

So at this point, and I'll, and I'll just take this in

terms of the, of, of the bankruptcy case itself, the Trustee's obligation is to maximize the benefit, maximize the recovery for the benefit of creditors. In this case we have a \$40,000, approximately \$40,000 unsecured creditor pool. Based upon my understanding if the Court was to approve the \$300,000 settlement, that those creditors would be paid one hundred cents on the dollar. That is what the Trustee is here seeking to protect.

The only other alternative would be for someone, and, and we discussed this numerous years ago, of coming in and saying, I'll pay them, let me go forward, then there's no risk to the creditors. That hasn't taken place nor it appears could take place.

So the Court is left in the inevitable position to, in essence, determine whether or not the settlement which would, assuming that the Plaintiff was fully successful under all of the theories, receive a much reduced surplus from the Estate. It appears at this point, at least from, from my consideration, that the risk of appeal and the risk of collectability are sufficient to get the Trustee over the hurdle in terms of business Judgement in, in accepting the settlement.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. DiMINO: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. I'll hear you.

MISS MASON: Thank you, Your Honor.

I, I listened very carefully to the Trustee's statements and I would like to address those statements for Your Honor.

In the first instance in terms of the merits of the appeal, the Trustee and L.I.S.T. Counsel had every opportunity to present this Court with law to support their position. They have not. And the reason they have not is because I have plenty of law to demonstrate that this case will win on appeal. All right. There's not a single fact that they can point to that demonstrates that this case has any weakness.

So in terms of the merits on the appeal, we are at the tail end of the process. I'm going to be submitting my brief, which I have already written, in five days. This is --

THE COURT: You're, you're, you're telling the Court that there is no risk.

MISS MASON: I am telling the Court that the risk is deminimous compared to the gain. I have a huge amount of attorney's fees that is being potentially compromised, seriously compromised and I'm the one who is saying, I'm the one who is saying I'm willing to take that risk.

The, the Trustee is supposed to be looking out for my interests and he's not. And he's supposed to be looking out for, you know, the interests of the Debtor and he's not.

So in terms of that, if I'm the one who is willing to say, I'm willing to take that risk and I'm the one who has the

most knowledge, personal knowledge as to the merits of that risk because Your Honor appointed me as the person to be responsible for that, as being the expert in that, it should be, it should fall on my shoulders to be able to say I reject this, it's not fair. And as far as collectability, we're not dealing with an organization that is going to be looking at bankruptcy nor can this organization discharge this debt in bankruptcy because it's protected from being discharged. THE COURT: That doesn't apply here. It's only --The reference you're making applies to a Debtor, not to a creditor or a Judgment creditor. MISS MASON: The, the reason why I make that point is because they have said, oh, well, if we're found quilty, we'll file for, for bankruptcy. Okay. So suffice it to say they have made \$2 million last year and the year --THE COURT: And how much did they expend? MISS MASON: After putting, after taking care of this

MISS MASON: After putting, after taking care of this award, after putting it on their books, they had money left over. They have scheduled this debt on their books.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MISS MASON: So it's taking into account --

THE COURT: Is there anything else?

MISS MASON: No, Your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
THE COURT: All right. Last call. Anyone have
 1
 2
      anything they want to add? All right.
               It's unfortunate that the claim here is really being
 3
      raised on behalf of the Debtor and it's Counsel.
 4
               However, what is before the Court is only a
 5
     determination to be made as to whether this at the lowest level
 6
 7
     of reasonableness in the compromise.
              It's the same standard I used before when I didn't
 8
 9
     think it was appropriate. But in this case I, I do.
              I believe that there is an inherent risk in the
10
11
              There is a risk that there will be very little to
12
     compensate the Trustee in this case on behalf of the Debtor.
13
     There is substantial delay ahead which diminishes any recovery
14
     to anyone until it is ultimately decided. There is no evidence
15
     that it is fully collectible if it were to be obtained.
              And most important I have to give credit to a
16
17
     Trustee's business judgement after reviewing all of the issues
     placed before him and therefore I must determine that the
18
19
     Trustee's motion to be granted. Settle an Order.
20
              MR. PERGAMENT: Thank you, Your Honor.
              MS. SCHNEIDER: For $40,000?
21
              THE COURT: It's $300,000.
22
              MS. SCHNEIDER: (Crying). You -- I can't believe it.
23
     You (inaudible). I hope you're happy. You are unfair. You
24
25
     came after.
```

```
THE COURT: I'll take a five minute break and then
 1
 2
      I'll resume the calendar.
 3
               MS. SCHNEIDER: Seventeen years.
 4
            (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 11:30 a.m.)
 5
      [11:30:41]
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATION		
2			
3	I, Jodi Kanestrin, certify that the foregoing transcript is a		
4	true and accurate record of the proceedings.		
5			
6			
7	Jedi Karistin		
8	The Rake Sett		
9			
10	JODI KANESTRIN		
11			
12	ADL Transcription Services, Inc.		
13	24 Crossway Drive		
14	Deer Park, New York 11729		
15			
16	Date: December 12, 2013		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

affirms 25:15

< Dates >	11793 2:12	
December 10, 2013 1:16	11:30 50:4	<7>
December 12, 2013 51:16	13, 11:4	7 3:6, 37:6
may. 20:7	16th 9:24	
\$1 43:6	17th 2:5	
1,500 11:10	1996 29:16	< 9 >
100,000 26:25	1997. 29:16	9019(a 3:4
\$100,000. 22:22, 23:21, 43:11		[10:21:38] 4:2
150,000 5:20, 19:18		[11:30:41] 50:5
\$1 7,000 . 23:23	< 2 >	[94] 3:8
\$18,000. 10:24	20 33:18, 34:11	
2 19:13, 48:16	200 2:5	
200,000 33:20, 34:14	2000 36:18, 40:20	< A >
234,000 . 11:25	2000. 16:8, 30:3	A. 2:4, 2:15, 3:7, 43:3
28,000. 7:2	2004 10:3, 40:21	a.m. 1:17, 50:4
300,000 12:2, 17:7, 17:13,	2004. 30:4	ability 18:22
22:21, 23:20, 23:22, 26:15,	2007 7:5	able 21:15, 44:12, 48:4
32:7, 38:5, 43:11, 46:5	2008 16:9	above 19:4
300,000. 16:25, 17:8, 22:21,	2009 8:8	abuse 33:12
26:5, 49:22	2010 . 13:25	accept 38:24
340,000 11:5, 11:8, 11:12,	2011 19:5, 19:9, 19:12	accepting 46:21
15:15, 17:16, 46:3, 46:4,	2012 19:6	account 8:2, 25:20, 48:23
49:21	2012. 13:7	accountable 21:23, 22:1
540,000. 11:7	207 2:13	accounting 19:17
400,000 28:22, 42:24	212-319-9092 2:6	accrued 43:1
400,000. 31:5	226 2:23	accrues 14:19
342,000 11:8	24 34:11, 51:13	accruing 19:21
493,000 39:25	25th 9:23	accurate 51:4
500,000 . 39:25	290 1:13	achieved 38:17
70,000 23:17		acknowledged 8:20
70,000. 8:7, 12:2		act 20:21, 42:6
700,000 17:22, 25:21, 35:4,	< 3 >	action 31:21, 44:17
40:24, 41:2, 41:24	3305 2:12	actual 31:14
700,000. 12:9, 14:23, 22:22	341 24:16, 24:20, 24:23	actually 9:8, 11:9, 15:18, 2
75,000 7:1, 25:20, 30:21		add 12:3, 49:2
07 40:15		addition 17:13, 19:13, 26:
O. 5:2	< 4 >	43:14
	400 2:17	address 17:9, 22:10, 31:23
	475. 16:1	32:8, 32:17, 35:15, 47:2
< 0 >		addressed 11:10, 18:17, 3
14-85727 1:3		addresses 33:19
	< 5 >	ADL 51:12
	516-826-6500 2:13	administer 6:5
:1>	516-877-2424 2:18	Administrative 4:11, 7:11
0166 2:5	560 2:22	8:6, 9:14, 11:3, 12:1, 22:
0:21 1:17		22:24, 25:15, 25:16, 26:2
1/08/2013 3:8		26:4, 30:11
1530 2:17	< 6 >	administrator 17:9, 17:23
1722 1:14, 2:22	631-715-7800 2:23	adverse 31:21
	1	

afford 20:19 agencies 25:9 agency 25:15, 25:16 ago 5:15, 5:19, 6:25, 17:20, 24:20, 38:20, 46:10 agreed 23:3, 26:16 ahead 35:19, 49:13 Alfred 2:20, 5:10, 44:6 All-in-all 31:3 allow 6:5, 17:18 allowed 14:18, 36:1 almost 30:4, 36:7 already 13:2, 13:13, 18:9, 18:17, 18:20, 33:7, 33:8, 47:13 alternative 46:9 amendment 11:9 among 8:3, 29:1 amount 6:25, 8:6, 9:14, 15:15, 22:19, 26:17, 26:23, 30:24, 32:1, 44:9, 45:4, 45:22, 47:17 ample 36:22 annulity 28:15 answer 12:25, 16:20, 21:5, 24:4, 24:13, 24:21, 26:22 anybody 21:11, 27:3 apologize 21:14 apologized 21:8 apparently 28:2, 30:12 Appeal 13:5, 13:6, 13:7, 13:12, 14:5, 14:21, 18:13, 25:2, 25:22 27:19, 28:5, 28:12, 28:13, 29:10, 29:12, 29:21, 31:1, :10, 31:13, 32:3, 33:7, 33:11, 35:2, 35:22, 36:15, 37:18, 23, 38:10, 39:15, 41:14, 44:19, 44:22, 45:8, 46:19, 47:5, 30:14 47:8, 47:11, 49:11 Appeals 25:3, 25:4, 25:16 appearances 4:8 appearing 4:10, 4:19, 11:23 11, appears 38:1, 38:7, 45:18, 2:23. 46:12, 46:18 :2, Appellate 13:2, 13:20, 13:24, 18:16, 22:12, 22:14, 23:2, 23 25:14, 25:25, 26:7, 28:1, adverse 31:21 28:4, 29:22, 30:14, 31:17, affirmance 26:8 31:23, 34:23, 35:2, 39:11,

11729 51:14

41:10, 41:14, 41:16 application 20:14, 27:8, 27:9 applies 48:11 apply 48:10 applying 36:13 appoint 17:20 appointed 4:12, 48:2 appreciate 44:24 appropriate 9:1, 9:3, 10:17, 49:9 appropriately 10:15, 45:6, 45:20 Approval 3:4, 5:4, 5:17, 7:21, 7:22, 9:16, 10:14, 36:16, 36:17, 45:1 approve 16:16, 17:4, 25:14, 27:9, 46:5 approved 23:21, 39:13 approves 9:10 Approximately 5:18, 9:23, 11:7, 12:9, 14:12, 14:23, 16:25, 23:23, 39:24, 46:4 April 7:5, 8:7, 40:15 area 34:8 argued 38:10, 39:15, 44:1 arguing 15:16 argument 10:1, 15:19, 18:10, 18:16, 18:21, 24:25 arguments 27:7, 44:24 arising 9:6 arrive 12:10, 12:16 arrived 12:19 arriving 9:22 aside 23:11, 29:13 asks 20:22, 24:17 aspect 44:20 asserted 28:13 assess 13:22, 14:15 assessed 30:6, 36:20 assessment 7:18, 14:8 asset 20:18, 20:25, 21:1, 21:2, 24:14, 30:11, 36:20, 44:13 assets 20:24, 24:6, 25:6, 25:7, 42:9 assortment 10:19 assuming 41:20, 46:16 attempted 43:7 attention 6:7 Attorney 2:20, 4:9, 11:23, 15:23, 15:24, 20:19, 21:6,

21:7, 27:20, 34:15, 34:18, 47.18 attorneys 16:9 available 25:6 Avenue 2:5, 2:12 awarded 29:7, 30:21, 37:25 awards 29:12 aware 23:22, 24:8, 25:24, 41:13 awash 26:19 away 21:11, 31:5 B. 13:17 Back 5:16, 6:3, 13:25, 16:8, 21:24, 26:16, 26:18, 26:24, 29:1, 29:7, 29:8, 29:15. 29:16, 29:23, 31:8, 31:9, 31:24, 34:13, 35:2, 35:25, 36:1, 36:9, 36:11, 38:20, 44:10 balance 17:25 Bank 10:23, 25:20, 26:19, 26:23 Bankruptcy 1:1, 1:12, 3:4, 6:18, 16:2, 17:4, 21:12, 24:4, 42:14, 44:13, 46:1, 48:7, 48:8, 48:15 Barnard 3:5, 3:8, 4:20, 4:21, 6:7, 6:14, 7:19, 7:20, 23:2, 23:11, 23:15, 24:21, 26:6. 26:9, 37:4, 37:6, 39:3, 39:12, 39:18, 39:20, 39:22, 40:1, 40:9, 40:25, 41:22, 42:12 Based 18:15, 18:16, 19:2, 27:5, 36:4, 45:20, 46:4 basically 27:1, 30:18 basis 33:10, 35:21, 42:22, 44:2

become 7:7

49:12

bench 14:1

beginning 26:15

behalf 3:7, 4:19, 15:17, 18:4,

22:9, 24:19, 39:15, 49:4,

believe 8:7, 9:22, 10:19, 11:8,

27:8, 29:21, 30:1, 30:5,

14:6, 15:16, 22:15, 23:18,

30:13, 30:22, 31:6, 31:12,

36:1, 36:12, 36:15, 40:12,

41:24, 42:10, 49:10, 49:23

benefit 5:25, 6:16, 7:7, 8:21,

42:9, 46:2, 46:3 benefiting 30:12 benefits 17:14 best 13:22, 14:7, 14:14, 19:20, 38:17, 40:7, 40:9, 40:10, 43:8, 43:9, 43:23, 43:24, 43:25, 44:2 better 20:1, 37:15, 37:21 bill 8:11 bit 6:3 Blansky 2:10, 3:7, 4:18, 4:19, 5:14, 10:19, 10:22, 11:8, 11:12, 11:16, 22:25, 40:4, 40:12, 40:15, 40:20, 41:25 **body** 10:8 bond 14:22, 14:25, 25:3 books 19:16, 19:17, 19:18, 33:13, 48:20, 48:21 **bottom** 19:24 break 50:1 brief 13:25, 18:16, 23:2, 23:4, 23:8, 29:24, 33:8, 39:13, 39:14, 47:12 **briefed 41:15** briefing 9:21 **briefly 35:18 bring** 10:7 brings 27:1 brought 6:7, 33:17 burden 43:21, 43:22 business 6:15, 10:15, 39:1, 39:7, 42:12, 45:5, 46:21, 49:17 < C >

10:9, 10:12, 15:10, 15:20,

calculation 31:1, 40:1, 40:4, 40:13, 40:16, 40:21 calculations 9:23, 30:1, 40:22, 43:2 calendar 41:16, 41:18, 50:2 call 25:10, 49:1 called 15:22, 22:23 candidate 29:13 capability 15:7 capacity 7:20, 28:7 Capital 10:25 card 11:1 cards 11:1

care 48:19 **career 14:13** carefully 47:1 Carl 4:5 Carol 1:7, 2:8, 4:3 Case 1:3, 6:4, 6:8, 7:19, 8:17. 9:5, 10:3, 12:4, 12:5, 13:23, 14:2, 14:16, 15:25, 16:4, 16.7, 17:4, 18:12, 24:10, 28:4, 30:22, 32:20, 32:22, 33:13, 36:10, 36:22, 37:8, 39:5, 40:9, 40:10, 44:10, 44:13, 44:18, 44:20, 45:24, 46:1, 46:3, 47:8, 47:10, 49:9, 49:12 cases 8:4, 8:23, 16:3, 28:17. 32:15 cash 26:19 caught 24:12 caused 36:19 **causes** 44:17 causing 30:12 Central 1:14, 2:22 cents 42:5, 46:7 certain 25:12, 34:25 certainly 10:9, 29:9, 37:17, 43:10 certify 51:3 chance 32:3 change 11:10 Chapter 3:6, 11:4, 37:6 charging 9:7 **Circuit 43:17** circumstances 6:21, 8:21, 8:22, 9:4, 10:16, 32:10, 38:8, 38:18, 45:15 City 2:17 Claim 6:5, 6:6, 7:10, 8:6, 9:5, 9:6, 9:14, 10:25, 11:9, 11:10, 11:24, 11:25, 12:1, 13:3, 15:23, 20:22, 22:14, 22:23, 22:24, 27:19, 28:2, 28:8, 28:9, 29:14, 30:11, 31:8, 31:12, 31:24, 35:5, 37:13, 40:24, 43:10, 44:12, 49:3 Claimant 10:23, 32:6 claimed 24:5, 29:2 claiming 29:6, 29:16 claims 11:3, 11:9, 15:15, 15:22.

17:9, 17:23, 17:24, 24:7,

24:15, 24:18, 31:7, 32:8, 45:5 clarify 41:9 clear 15:24, 16:3, 30:22, 32:13, 33:25, 34:5, 34:12, 36:10, 41:23, 45:3 clearer 40:5 client 7:18, 15:17, 23:3, 23:13. 23:14, 26:4, 26:17, 26:18, 33-1 clock 36:9 **close** 40:20 **closely 35:21** co-worker 33:1 **Code** 16:2 colleagues 33:24 collect 13:3, 13:9, 17:19, 25:1 collectability 18:20, 18:21, 26:9, 41:25, 42:3, 42:7, 45:12, 45:13, 46:19, 48:6 collectible 49:15 college 20:25 comedy 13:9 comes 9:13, 15:10, 26:20 coming 46:10 commenced 30:4 comment 27:23, 29:21 commented 28:2 comments 27:18, 35:16 Commissioner 13:21 **commissions** 9:2, 23:22 compared 47:17 compensate 49:12 compensation 12:7 Compensatory 30:18 complained 29:3, 33:2 complaint 31:20 complaints 29:5, 31:14, 31:15 Compromise 3;3, 4:7, 16:2, 18:7, 35:5, 35:10, 42:23, 43:13, 43:16, 49:7 compromised 16:10, 44:25, 47:18, 47:19 compromising 43:10 concern 8:13, 45:15 concerns 5:23 conclude 29:23, 31:23, 44:2 concluded 50:4 concluding 31:17 conclusion 37:9, 45:13

conduct 31:10 conducted 24:16, 24:20 conducts 24:21 confirmed 28:11 consider 6:18 considerable 31:4 consideration 36:24, 42:6. 45:16, 46:18 considered 6:25, 16:11, 26:6. 26:9 constantly 33:21 contacting 33:22 contemplate 8:21 contemplated 8:16 contention 29:8 contesting 36:13, 36:15 context 6:13 continue 9:12, 17:18, 35:24, 36:2, 44:12 continued 9:19, 24:23, 36:8 continuing 14:19 contrary 35:25 **control** 37:24 Controversy 3:3 copy 32:20 Cordani 3:7, 18:4, 21:20, 27:21, 32:4 corporation 5:3 Correct 12:13, 39:18, 39:20 correctly 25:5 cost 6:1 **costs** 8:3 Counsel 4:13, 4:25, 7:10, 7:13, 7:16, 7:22, 9:2, 14:1, 17:21, 18:15, 22:11, 22:13, 23:2, 23:9, 23:10, 23:11, 26:3, 26:11, 26:12, 34:16, 34:17, 37:11, 42:14, 44:24, 47:5, 49:4 count 24:17 course 9:5, 9:15, 9:19, 23:24, 26:8, 41:20, 42:1, 42:12 credit 11:1, 49:16 Creditor 2:3, 4:10, 7:11, 7:12, 10:8, 14:6, 22:18, 32:14, 43:14, 43:23, 46:4, 48:12 creditors 4:12, 6:16, 6:22, 7:8, 7;14, 10:18, 10:20, 15:14, 15:20, 17:17, 17:24, 20:16,

21:16, 23:25, 25:22, 35:9,

37:19, 38:15, 38:22, 39:5, 42:4, 42:10, 42:11, 43:8, 43:23, 46:3, 46:6, 46:12 criticize 6:11 Crossway 51:13 **Crying 49:23** currently 12:1 < D > D. 13:7 damage 12:8, 18:8, 18:13, 19:17, 19:18, 31:11, 42:23 damaged 43:12 damages 13:22, 29:1, 29:6, 29:18, 29:20, 30:17, 30:18, 30:19, 31:2, 34:14, 35:24 Date 6:8, 9:24, 36:16, 40:16, 40:17, 51:16 David 2:10, 3:7, 4:18 day 8:15, 8:25, 9:13, 15:9, 25:13, 25:21 days 47:13 deadline 9:22 deal 6:13, 23:11 dealing 16:12, 48:6 dealt 23:19 debt 11:5, 11:13, 48:8, 48:21 **Debtor** 1:9, 2:8, 4:16, 5:24, 6:10, 7:9, 8:15, 8:17, 8:22, 9:3, 10:12, 15:11, 15:21, 17:15, 17:17, 17:25, 20:1, 20:10, 20:12, 24:21, 28:7, 28:21, 29:2, 30:5, 30:10, 35:9, 36:19, 38:3, 38:14. 39:6, 43:25, 44:11, 47:23, 48:11, 49:4, 49:12 Debtors 6:19 decided 7:17, 18:9, 20:21,

28:8, 49:14

44:14

deduct 17:13

Deer 51:14

default 7:6

decisions 41:18

Defendants 45:15

decision 13:7, 13:8, 13:16,

14:8, 31:16, 31:21, 32:21,

33:18, 35:8, 39:2, 39:7,

Defendant 27:21, 37:11, 39:13

defenses 37:12, 39:4, 40:25. 41:1 **defer** 31:19 definitely 28:3 delay 6:1, 30:6, 30:12, 30:13, 36:18, 36:19, 49:13 delayed 30:9 demarcation 9:17 deminimous 42:8, 47:17 demonstrate 13:19, 15:3, 43:4, 43:22, 47:8 demonstrated 18:7, 18:9, 18:20 demonstrates 47:10 demonstrating 16:3, 43:15 denied 5:21 Department 10:1, 13:24, 41:17 dependent 12:7 depending 10:9 **depends** 6:19 described 36:2 Despite 23:7 detailed 43:2 determination 7:21, 10:2, 28.5, 34:2, 44:11, 44:16, 49:6 determine 8:25, 16:14, 16:23, 45:3, 46:15, 49:18 determined 44:22 determining 45:16 dice 37:21 dicey 7:9 Dick 21:20 difference 32:1, 40:3 different 5:19, 8:1, 34:8, 40:1 difficult 13:18 diligence 6:11 diminishes 49:13 Dimino 2:20, 5:8, 5:9, 5:10, 44:4, 44:6, 46:23 direct 31:11 direction 23:7 directives 7:23 disagree 29:9 disbursed 8:14 discharge 48:8 discharged 34:17, 48:9 disclose 7:10 disclosed 6:6 disclosures 6:19

Discover 10:23 discretion 16:23, 31:19, 33:12 discrimination 6:5, 14:2, 14:14, 28:17 **discuss** 32:16 discussed 40:21, 46:10 dismissed 44:20 disregard 10:7 distress 30:18, 30:20, 30:21, 31:11 distribution 38:22 DISTRICT 1:2 divided 37:23, 38:1 dividends 27:3 Division 13:10, 13:14, 13:21, 22:12, 22:14, 23:2, 25:14, 26:8, 28:1, 28:4, 28:6, 28:10, 28:11, 29:7, 29:11, 29:20, 29:22, 30:2, 30:6, 30:15, 30:20, 31:17, 31:18, 31:19, 31:23, 32:24, 33:4, 33:18, 33:19, 34:4, 35:25, 36:8, 36:17, 36:18, 39:11, 41:11, 41:14, 41:16, 41:17 Divisions 28:15 docket 11:2 documents 26:10, 41:4 doing 23:4, 23:5, 24:12 dollar. 42:5, 46:7 donations 25:8 done 9:17 **DOROTHY 1:20** double 10:5 doubt 45:13 down 5:25, 8:9, 23:19, 37:20 drafted 33:7 dragged 27:21 **Drive** 51:13 during 18:15, 30:7, 30:13,

< E >
e-mailing 33:21
earlier 11:9
early 8:9
earned 19:12
EASTERN 1:2
easy 10:16
economics 44:24

30:19, 36:6, 36:21

effect 16:7 effectively 25:8 efforts 33:19, 33:21, 33:23, eight 30:5, 36:7, 41:15 eighteen 41:18 **EISENBERG** 1:20 either 25:8, 28:19 elements 28:25, 29:6, 30:17 Elizabeth 2:3, 2:4, 4:9, 21:16 eluded 41:23 emotional 30:18, 30:20, 30:21, 31:11 emphasize 35:7 employed 29:15 employee 29:2 employment 7:13, 14:11, 14:13, 28:16, 36:3, 36:4, 36:5 end 8:14, 8:25, 9:13, 25:13, 25:21, 37:18, 47:12 enforce 13:10 enforced 14:18, 25:3 enforcement 14:5, 14:17 enforcing 12:8 **enormous** 31:25 Entered 3:8, 16:7 entire 9:3, 14:4, 21:15, 36:7, 36:21, 45:22 entirely 12:7 entirety 42:16 entities 35:8 entitled 9:4, 22:19, 29:23 entity 13:14, 15:13, 42:9 equipment 25:8 **equity** 8:19 especially 25:25, 42:8 **essence** 46:15 establish 31:10 established 17:7 Estate 4:10, 4:11, 5:25, 6:16, 7:8, 9:16, 9:20, 9:22, 11:24, 15:8, 15:10, 42:11, 44:3, 46:17 estimated 8:6 etcetera 26:21 event 7:3, 8:15, 30:23, 38:23 everybody 15:12, 45:23

everyone 44:25, 45:22

everything 14:10, 35:3

evidence 29:19, 30:19, 31:13, 34:19, 36:1, 49:14 exactly 42:22 examine 29:22 examined 35:20 example 30:18, 35:23, 36:13 exceptional 7:19 excessive 30:22 excuse 17:21 exercised 10:15 exercising 6:14, 45:5, 45:19 Exhibit 12:18, 13:7, 13:17, 33:19, 43:3, 43:4 exist 17:14, 45:2 exonerated 32:4 **expect** 18:14 **expend** 48:18 expense 6:1, 9:20, 23:4 expenses 9:11, 19:4, 19:15, 23:18, 25:12, 26:20, 27:2 experienced 6:10, 42:13, 42-14 expert 26:11, 48:3 expertise 34:9 explain 22:13, 26:3, 28:23, 40:4 explained 20:18 explicit 23:7 exposed 31:9 expressly 13:8 extend 23:3 extending 23:1 extension 23:8 extent 9:10, 28:17, 45:3

< F >
face 38:8
fact 6:20, 18:21, 33:20, 47:9
factor 41:23
factors 8:3
facts 8:20, 9:4, 27:5, 27:6
failed 7:10, 29:19, 29:24, 43:21
fails 43:16
failure 34:10, 36:19
fair 43:22, 48:5
fall 48:4
familiar 18:18, 22:12
far 38:23, 48:6
fault 30:8

favor 13:2, 18:10, 34:19

Federal 1:13, 2:22, 3:3 Federation 5:1 fee 14:4, 16:24 feel 12:24, 32:7 feels 21:24 fees 9:1, 10:11, 12:2, 15:24, 15:25, 16:6, 16:9, 16:10, 16:12, 16:17, 16:22, 16:25, 17:3, 17:6, 17:10, 17:11, 23:24, 25:23, 32:16, 33:10, 37:25, 43:12, 47:18 felt 14:2 few 18:24, 19:2 fiduciary 7:20, 37:19 fifteen 32:15 figure 12:19 figures 12:11, 15:4 file 13:3, 23:1, 23:8, 48:15 filed 7:14, 9:6, 11:2, 14:23, 15:1, 16:8, 18:17, 19:3, 20:19, 39:13 filing 25:3 final 40:13 financial 26:17, 45:14 financially 26:10 find 5:16, 36:6, 38:11, 45:19 firm 23:23, 27:16 First 13:1, 22:16, 25:1, 47:4 five 5:15, 5:18, 6:25, 38:20, 38:21, 47:13, 50:1 Floor 2:5 flow 39:16 flux 44:18 **follow** 7:23 follows 15:21 foregoing 51:3 forgot 24:11 form 24:4, 24:15 Former 34:16 forth 12:18, 21:24, 26:16 forty-nine 43:15 Forum 2:15, 3:6, 5:1, 22:9, 25:6, 25:19, 27:16 forward 39:8, 40:16, 44:16, 46:11 found 32:22, 48:14 four 15:5, 17:19, 38:12 frankly 35:2, 36:19

fresh 24:3, 38:14, 38:16

friends 33:22, 33:24

frustrations 7:24 full 6:19, 14:20, 17:23, 17:24, 18:22, 24:1 fully 15:6, 18:9, 24:8, 33:19, 41:14, 46:16, 49:15 fund 19:12 funds 8:17, 25:11

< G > gain 47:17 Garden 2:17 General 9:1 generate 15:8, 18:22 generated 15:3 genesis 6:4 genuine 39:1 gets 22:21, 25:21, 25:23, 38:16, 45:23 give 9:3, 16:4, 24:6, 49:16 Given 22:15, 38:13, 38:18, 39:4, 45:4 glad 33:17 **gobbled 25:23** gotten 38:6 government 25:9 Granovi 8:20 grant 14:9, 27:8, 42:15 granted 49:19 grants 25:9, 25:10 Gross 2:16, 4:25, 26:19 ground 13:11 grounds 28:12, 36:16 guess 9:12, 10:2 guilty 48:14

< H >
half 28:20, 35:5, 36:8, 44:9
hand 21:2
handled 34:16
handles 15:25
handling 12:4
happen 17:19, 28:23, 39:14
happened 24:9, 28:1
happens 12:20
happy 28:23, 49:24
harassed 33:1
harassment 29:3, 29:14, 31:7,

hard 25:24, 26:14, 38:5, 42:9 head 32:24 hear 4:8, 18:1, 20:12, 20:14. 35:11, 37:3, 46:24 heard 11:17, 11:20, 18:1, 20:4. 20:11, 27:10, 27:11, 32:11, 40:21, 40:25, 44:5 Hearing 3:1, 6:9, 6:11, 6:14, 23:25, 26:2, 26:4, 30:3. 30:20, 33:5, 34:15, 34:16, 34:18 hearings 38:11 held 21:23, 21:25 Herbst 2:11, 4:19, 4:22, 41:25 hide 21:10 higher 14:21 hold 21:1 holding 15:23 home 45:23 **honest** 6:19 hope 49:24 huge 47:17 Human 13:10, 13:14, 13:21, 28:6, 28:10, 28:11, 29:7, 29:11, 29:20, 30:2, 30:6, 30:21, 32:24, 34:4, 35:25. 36:8-36:17-36:18 hundred 37:20, 42:5, 46:6 hurdle 46:20

< 1 > I. 40:5 idea 17:12 Identify 4:8, 27:13, 37:5 ignores 30:10 imagine 5:15, 9:25 immediately 19:22 important 35:8, 42:5, 49:16 improper 44:21 inaudible 9:15, 23:13, 24:9, 49:24 Inc. 51:12 incentive 19:21 incidents 7:16 income 15:3, 18:23, 19:3, 36:4 incorrect 43:5 increases 37:22

hurt 25:21

hurts 6:22

incur 23:4 incurred 8:3, 8:10 Indicated 39:24 indicates 7:11 individual 27:21, 28:7, 31:15 inevitable 46:14 inexperienced 26:13 inherent 45:8, 49:10 initial 16:9, 28:5 initially 6:6 instance 33:10, 47:4 instead 37:21 insuring 42:4 integrity 6:18 intends 17:12 Interest 7:5, 14:19, 15:8, 19:20, 29:17, 30:1, 30:3, 30:7, 30:13, 30:23, 33:11, 33:12, 33:14, 35:9, 36:12, 36:14, 36:21, 40:2, 42:11, 43:1, 43:8, 43:10, 43:14, 43:23, 43:24 43:25, 44:2 interests 47:22, 47:23 invalid 31:24 invoice 8:11 involved 44:25 Island 2:15, 3:6, 5:1, 22:9, 25:6, 25:19, 27:16 Islip 1:14, 2:22 issue 6:23, 13:1, 13:4, 18:8, 18:10, 18:12, 18:19, 28:8, 29:21, 29:22, 31:18, 31:22, 34:3, 35:23, 36:12, 36:13, 36:22, 41:22, 41:25, 42:3 issues 6:13, 13:1, 28:14, 30:14, 30:25, 31:16, 33:3, 33:6, 44:23, 45:7, 45:14, 45:20, 49:17 itemization 12:19 itemized 43:18 itself 46:1

< J >
Jackson 27:16
Jerusalem 2:12
job 34:6, 34:7
jobs 33:23, 33:24
JODI 2:24, 51:3, 51:10
joke 21:24, 21:25

Judge 1:20, 5:9, 22:23, 44:6, 46:23

Judgement 6:15, 7:4, 7:17, 9:9, 10:15, 15:7, 15:9, 19:21, 21:15, 25:1, 25:3, 25:18, 35:1, 35:4, 42:2, 42:12, 45:6, 45:10, 45:11, 45:19, 46:21, 49:17

Judgements 19:19

Judgment 48:12

Judiciary 9:7, 16:1

jurisdiction 18:8

justify 31:8, 36:11

< K >
KANESTRIN 2:24, 51:3, 51:10
Kenneth 3:5, 3:7, 4:20, 37:6
kind 26:13
knowledge 12:24, 48:1
knows 34:18

< L >

lack 18:8

Lamonica 2:11, 4:19, 23:23

largest 4:10, 9:5, 10:24, 10:25, 11:23, 43:13, 43:14

Last 12:5, 14:12, 15:4, 18:24, 19:2, 20:18, 48:17, 49:1

later 6:7

Law 8:17, 9:7, 15:24, 16:1, 16:3, 18:17, 18:18, 24:5, 24:7, 24:11, 24:18, 27:15, 30:22, 31:20, 32:13, 33:8, 33:9, 33:11, 33:25, 34:5, 34:12, 36:10, 36:22, 47:6, 47:8

33:11, 33:25, 34:5, 34:12, 36:10, 36:22, 47:6, 47:8 lawsuit 42:7 layers 13:13 leads 15:16 least 45:2, 46:18 leave 29:13, 38:15 leaves 17:16, 17:17 left 19:14, 19:18, 20:17, 24:1, 46:14, 48:20 leftover 10:11 legal 12:2, 15:24, 15:25, 16:6, 21:5, 23:24, 43:12 legally 31:24 length 30:9

31:8, 31:18, 34:20

lengthy 36:5 less 26:24, 28:22, 31:5, 32:5, 35:5 level 49:6 Lewis 27:16 liabilities 25:12 lien 9:7, 16:6, 16:9 liens 16:22, 17:13 life 12:5, 21:18, 21:21, 21:25 lift 8:19 liaht 6:9 lightly 10:7 likelihood 8:2, 14:21, 28:18, 31:4 likely 27:24 line 9:18, 19:24 list 24:11, 24:14, 36:20 listed 44:13 listened 47:1 litigating 28:16 litigation 9:19, 14:12, 38:8, 38:9 little 5:15, 6:3, 7:8, 49:11 LLP 2:4, 2:11, 2:16 loan 19:22 Long 2:15, 3:6, 4:25, 5:1, 22:9, 25:6, 25:19, 27:16, 34:17, longer 13:4, 19:25 look 34:11 looked 12:11 looking 35:4, 37:9, 47:21, 47:22, 48:7 lose 14:9, 14:22, 24:10, 35:3, 37:17 losing 43:11 loss 45:8 lot 26:3, 42:1, 42:9 **lowest 49:6** Lynn 1:7, 2:8, 4:3, 4:5, 4:16

< M >
magnitude 5:20, 8:1, 10:5
main 12:14
major 45:7
maker 31:16
Maniscalco 2:11, 4:19, 23:24
manufactured 22:24
Marc 2:15, 4:24

Mark 27:15 market 34:6 Masters 21:1 Matter 1:5, 3:3, 4:3, 6:1, 23:1, 28:9, 31:20, 43:6 **matters** 26:13 maximize 46:2 mean 25:10 meaningless 38:22 means 19:24, 25:10, 26:20, 41:19 measured 9:8, 9:11 Medicaid 17:14 medical 30:19 meet 10:13, 29:19, 29:24 meeting 24:23 meetings 24:16, 24:20 merit 27:7, 41:2 merits 8:3, 13:12, 13:22, 14:8, 14:15, 14:16, 18:3, 18:7, 22:13, 23:12, 27:19, 28:2, 28:9, 28:21, 29:9, 29:13, 31:4, 31:6, 32:19, 33:7, 36:25, 37:12, 44:21, 47:4, 47:11, 48:1 mess 21:9 messed 21:7 met 13:19 Mickel 21:20 million 19:13, 21:8, 43:7, 48:16 minimal 25:6 minute 50:1 mischaracterized 29:11 misinformation 22:15 misrepresentation 24:24 misrepresented 24:23 mistake 20:18, 20:20, 22:2, 22:3, 24:13 mistaken 25:2 mitigate 29:18, 29:20, 34:10 mitigated 33:20, 33:25, 34:5, 34:13, 35:24 mitigation 29:24, 33:16, 33:19, 33:21, 33:23, 35:23 moment 16:7, 37:16 Money 10:11, 10:23, 10:25,

15:10, 19:13, 21:2, 24:1,

25:22, 26:19, 26:20, 27:2,

37:23, 37:25, 38:16, 45:24,

48:20

month 15:9
months 8:11, 41:15, 41:18
morning 4:18, 4:24, 5:9, 22:8
Motion 3:3, 4:6, 5:4, 5:13, 5:16, 7:15, 20:16, 22:11, 42:15, 49:19
MS 4:5, 4:16, 6:11, 7:13, 8:6, 12:4, 16:7, 20:6, 20:8, 20:15, 20:23, 22:16, 23:14, 24:2, 24:3, 49:21, 49:23, 50:3
myself 14:1, 14:15

< N >
name 27:15
near 9:24, 16:1
need 26:17, 35:7

needs 37:9 negotiated 26:14, 38:4 negotiations 38:6 New 1:2, 1:14, 2:5, 2:17, 2:22, 9:17, 15:25, 21:17, 51:14 next 10:1, 39:14 nicer 22:25 Nine 7:5, 14:19, 15:8, 19:20, 29:17, 30:7, 30:13, 36:21, 40:16 No. 1:3, 24:9, 24:22 non-disclosure 8:18 non-for-profit 25:7 non-payment 7:3 non-profit 14:25, 15:2 None 7:14 nor 46:12, 48:7 Not-for-profit 5:3, 27:1, 27:4 noteworthy 42:21 nothing 17:16, 17:17, 18:6, 25:22, 37:18 notice 39:23 notwithstanding 8:17 Number 5:23, 6:17, 8:9, 9:15, 12:12, 12:17, 22:23, 23:17, 25:5, 28:25, 38:7, 40:17, 41:2, 41:3, 41:10, 41:22

< 0 >

NY 2:5, 2:12

numbers 38:2, 43:4

numerous 16:3, 28:12, 46:10

object 20:15 objection 18:4, 20:14, 27:7 objections 7:9, 7:14, 43:18, 43:19 obligation 29:18, 29:19, 46:2 obligations 29:25, 30:11 obtained 17:15, 36:2, 45:9, 49:15 obtaining 14:5 obviously 42:8, 44:14, 45:21 occasions 33:22 offensive 31:10 offer 26:15, 34:7, 37:10, 43:20 offered 37:15, 44:10 Office 2:21, 5:10, 5:21, 21:5, 44:7 Okay 11:6, 11:11, 16:13, 16:15, 16:19, 18:2, 23:19, 32:17, 33:10, 34:7, 48:16 old 37:8 once 11:10, 20:16, 33:2, 38:12, 41:14, 44:8 One 4:11, 5:23, 6:17, 7:24, 10:6. 10:25, 11:8, 12:6, 12:14, 15:11, 24:17, 28:14, 29:6, 31:8, 31:9, 33:14, 37:20, 39:21, 41:10, 42:4, 45:4, 45:7, 46:6, 47:19, 47:20, 47:24, 47:25 ones 10:16, 10:17 opine 28:9 opinion 14:16, 28:16, 40:4. opportunity 10:5, 21:13, 21:14, 38:14, 39:10, 47:5 oppose 12:14, 39:10 opposed 5:20, 23:8, 35:10 opposition 8:5 oral 18:16 Order 4:12, 17:20, 36:14, 40:13, 49:19 ordered 17:19 organization 15:3, 15:6, 48:7, original 28:11, 28:13 ourselves 38:11 outcome 10:9, 38:17

outside 19:12, 34:8

overstated 30:2

overali 45:4

overturned 45:10 own 15:4

< P > Page 13:16, 33:18, 34:11 paid 14:20, 15:8, 15:12, 17:23, 17:24, 19:25, 20:16, 24:1, 38:15, 45:23, 46:6 panel 28:1 paper 33:22 papers 8:5, 9:21, 12:18, 14:23, 17:12, 18:6, 39:23, 40:3, 40:18, 43:1 Park 2:5, 51:14 part 13:17 partial 8:18 participate 8:24 participation 8:18 particularly 31:12 partner 4:22 party 45:9 passed 13:13 pay 18:23, 19:21, 19:22, 19:24, 20:1, 21:16, 21:20, 25:20, 26:18, 26:20, 29:1, 29:7, 29:8, 29:15, 29:16, 29:23, 31:8, 31:9, 31:25, 34:14, 35:25, 36:1, 36:9, 36:11, 46:11 paying 15:7 payment 7:1 payments 7:2 payroll 26:21 pays 27:2 PC 27:16 pending 44:11 **penny 12:6** pens 8:9 perceived 32:23, 32:24, 32:25 perceives 10:10 percent 7:6, 14:20, 15:8, 19:20, 29:17, 30:7, 30:13, 36:21, 37:20, 40:16 **PERGAMENT 2:15, 2:16,** 4:24, 4:25, 20:5, 20:7, 20:10, 20:13, 22:8, 38:4, 41:6, 41:8, 41:13, 49:20

periods 36:5 permitted 13:9, 16:2 person 48:2 personal 12:24, 48:1 pervasive 31:10 phonetic 8:20, 21:20 picture 9:3 place 46:12, 46:13 placed 41:16, 49:18 Plaintiff 34:19, 39:15, 44:21, 46:16 Plaza 1:13, 2:17, 2:22 plenty 47:8 plus 9:11 point 6:11, 10:1, 15:13, 20:25, 27:24, 29:4, 32:19, 33:9, 34:24, 37:9, 38:21, 38:24, 45:18, 45:25, 46:18, 47:9, 48:13 point, 10:2, 16:21, 32:17 points 22:10, 22:16, 41:9, 43:15, 43:18 **polite** 22:25 pool 46:4 portion 17:23 position 13:22, 14:7, 14:14, 15:19, 26:17, 27:23, 34:8, 46:14, 47:6 possibility 37:21 possible 40:11 **possibly 28:19** post 14:22, 14:24 posture 9:18, 9:19, 39:4 potential 39:5, 39:6, 44:9 potentially 17:14, 17:22, 47:18 practice 14:13 practicing 14:11 pre-petition 7:13, 9:7 predict 25:24 preferable 45:21 present 4:21, 5:2, 15:19, 34:15, 47.6 presentation 11:14

presented 10:4, 34:19, 37:11,

Previously 14:23, 18:17, 28:1,

39:4, 41:1

Presently 11:25

32:14, 32:21

Primarily 29:1

prime 29:13

principal 7:4 principals 13:9 pro 4:10, 11:23, 20:19, 20:21, 21:4 probably 5:14, 10:24 problems 26:3 procedural 44:19 Procedure 3:4 proceed 9:20, 12:20 proceeding 27:18, 30:4, 30:9 proceedings 27:20, 27:23, 50.4, 51.4 process 27:22, 41:14, 47:12 produced 30:19 professional 10:11, 14:16 project 36:4 proof 10:10 properly 6:14 proposal 14:9 Proposed 5:19, 7:1, 11:3, 16:17, 17:4, 17:8, 27:17, 43:20 prosecute 9:13 prospective 8:8 protect 17:3, 46:8 protected 15:25, 16:10, 16:18, 17:6. 48:9 provide 8:16, 17:12, 32:15 provided 13:16, 15:1, 19:8, 26:9, 32:20, 42:25, 43:2, 43:3 provides 7:3 proximity 31:22 public 15:2, 26:10, 27:2 pulled 33:8 purpose 6:8, 6:9 purposely 24:9 purposes 25:11 Pursuant 3:3, 4:12, 13:8, 17:20 pursue 24:6, 24:18, 24:19, 25:17, 28:7 pursued 6:2 pursuing 6:12 put 19:5, 19:16, 23:11, 40:21 puts 7:21 putting 6:15, 48:19, 48:20

< Q > quarterly 7:2 question 12:23, 12:25, 20:22, 24:4, 24:13, 24:20, 26:22, 39:21 questions 7:7, 21:5, 21:7, 24:17

< R >R. 3:5, 3:7, 4:20, 37:6 raised 31:1, 33:4, 33:9, 49:4 ran 30:2 rate 14:19 rather 44:19 re 3:1 re-opened 6:4, 6:8 reach 9:12, 38:21 reached 8:7, 8:8 read 13:25, 32:21, 40:3 reading 33:21, 41:3, 41:4 real 27:7 realitible 39:6 really 21:10, 21:21, 26:22, 27:6, 42:3, 49:3 reason 15:21, 18:14, 45:13, 47:7, 48:13 reasonable 16:24, 32:9, 38:7, 38:13, 39:7, 43:17, 43:22, 45:4, 45:17 reasonableness 43:20, 49:7 reasons 10:13, 12:14, 32:2, 12.7 recall 5:18 recalled 44:8 receive 9:4, 17:25, 34:25, 35:24, 46:17 received 12:6, 36:4 **recent** 8:11 recognize 13:20 recognized 26:21, 32:14 recommend 38:24, 39:7 record 29:18, 34:21, 35:20, 35:21, 36:1, 36:10, 51:4

recover 28:22

recovering 15:12

46:2, 49:13

reduce 30:15

recovers 22:21

recovered 8:14, 9:8, 22:19

recovery 8:19, 22:20, 37:20,

37:22, 38:13, 39:5, 39:24,

period 29:24, 36:7, 36:21

perhaps 14:14

reduced 28:19, 30:24, 34:13, 37:1, 45:11, 46:17 reference 48:11 reflect 18:22 regard 7:19 regarding 16:6, 30:20, 42:25 reject 14:10, 34:7, 48:4 relates 14:15 relatively 10:8 relevant 28:18, 35:8 remain 10:18 remains 44:18 remand 41:21 remanded 28:9, 38:10 remedy 7:6 remote 31:14, 31:20 **remove 34:6** render 28:15 rendered 13:7, 13:15 rendering 41:17 rent 26:21 repeat 22:17 repeats 22:17 replete 29:18 reply 9:25, 33:8 represent 16:7, 27:14, 27:16 representation 12:6, 36:24 representations 27:25 represented 5:7, 37:11, 42:13 representing 12:4, 21:17, 27:20 requested 26:10 respect 22:10, 24:25, 27:19, 31:1, 37:12, 40:2, 41:2, 41:10 respond 35:14 response 42:19 responsible 48:3 rest 11:2 resting 14:4 restricted 25:10 result 31:16 resume 50:2 retained 7:23, 8:7 retainer 9:8 retaliation 14:3, 29:4, 29:14, 31:7, 31:12, 31:22, 31:24, 34:20 retention 7:12 returns 15:1, 18:22, 19:3, 19:8,

26:23 revenue 25:1, 25:8 revenues 26:19 reversal 26:7, 41:21 reverse 25:17, 36:16 reversed 29:12, 31:13 review 13:14, 13:18, 29:10, 43:19 reviewed 26:11, 32:21 reviewing 49:17 reward 27:3, 37:15 Richard 3:7 Rights 13:10, 13:14, 13:21, 28:6, 28:10, 28:11, 29:7, 29:12, 29:20, 30:3, 30:6, 30:21, 32:24, 34:4, 35:25, 36:8, 36:17, 36:19 rise 27:17 risk 14:7, 26:6, 26:7, 26:8, 42:6, 45:7, 45:8, 45:10, 45:11, 45:12, 46:11, 46:19, 47:15, 47:16, 47:20, 47:25, 48:2, 49:10, 49:11 road 23:19 roll 37:21 roughly 7:2, 11:5, 41:19 ruined 21:21 **Rule** 3:4 ruled 13:2 run 30:7, 30:23, 36:2, 36:8, 42:6 running 30:3 runs 30:13 < S > salary 33:20 satisfied 18:23, 19:19 satisfy 16:22, 17:16, 43:16, saying 36:14, 46:11, 47:19, 47:20 says 8:18, 8:23, 12:21, 20:23, 24:5, 24:6, 25:4, 33:11

scenario 8:23, 40:9, 40:10

SCHNEIDER 1:7, 2:8, 4:4, 4:5,

4:16, 7:13, 12:4, 16:8, 20:6,

20:8, 20:15, 20:23, 23:14,

24:2, 24:3, 49:21, 49:23,

schedule 30:11, 36:20

scheduled 48:21

50:3 **89** 4:10, 11:23, 20:19, 20:21, Second 10:1, 13:11, 13:24, 32:19, 41:17, 43:17 Secondly 45:12 Secured 2:3, 4:10, 11:24, 11:25, 14:6, 15:23, 22:18, 32:14, 43:13 security 19:20 Seeking 3:4, 5:4, 5:16, 13:11, 17:3, 32:6, 46:7 seem 41:2 seems 11:1, 38:16, 41:1 seen 8:11 selected 36:17 self-employment 36:3 sensitive 6:20 separate 33:22 serious 7:6 seriously 43:12, 47:19 **serves** 27:2 Services 51:12 sets 12:18 Settle 23:1, 26:5, 49:19 settled 43:7 Settlement 3:5, 5:5, 5:19, 6:24, 7:1, 7:3, 7:18, 8:8, 8:16, 8:21, 9:9, 9:10, 9:18, 10:10, 10:14, 16:17, 17:5, 17:8, 23:6, 23:20, 25:14, 27:9, 27:17, 32:8, 32:9, 37:15, 38:25, 39:7, 40:11, 41:23, 42:10, 43:7, 43:9, 44:9, 45:1, 45:17, 46:6. 46:15, 46:21 seven 15:4, 43:18 Seventeen 21:22, 50:3 Several 13:13, 22:10, 22:16, 22:17, 26:18, 29:16 **severe** 31:9 sexual 29:3, 29:14, 34:20 sexually 33:1 Shall 37:20, 38:20 shoulders 48:4 shouldn't 30:7 show 26:23, 34:9 showing 33:9, 34:19, 34:20 side 5:25

simple 43:3 **simply** 31:9 single 9:5, 10:24, 10:25, 33:9, 33:13, 33:14, 47:9 Sir 11:15, 39:21 sites 16:4 situation 33:15, 37:10, 37:14. 37:17 8ix 5:15, 5:18, 6:25, 41:15 slew 28:14 slim 14:20 small 10:8, 10:20, 10:23, 10:25 smaller 11:1, 40:22 sole 14:13 **someone** 46:9 somewhat 44:25 sorry 19:1, 21:9, 41:8 **sort** 8:9 Special 4:13, 7:10, 7:16, 7:22, 17:20, 17:21, 22:11, 23:9, 23:10 specified 25:11 **spend 23:5 spent** 42:1 stake 43:14 stand 22:5, 36:24 standard 13:18, 24:19, 29:10, standing 13:3, 20:13, 38:11 standpoint 37:19 start 21:17, 24:3, 38:15, 38:16 State 13:2, 14:11, 26:1, 28:6, 28:15, 32:15, 33:25, 39:10, 43:13 stated 14:1, 18:14 statement 42:25 statements 18:15, 47:2 States 1:1, 2:21, 5:10, 13:8, status 7:12, 8:10, 27:23, 44:10 statute 16:1, 16:2 Statutory 14:19, 15:23, 33:10, 33:12, 33:14, 36:12 stayed 25:4 Stipulation 3:5 stood 22:4 strong 14:2, 32:22 structure 7:1 sub-category 24:15 subject 7:22, 9:16, 23:24

significantly 7:25

60

subjected 29:3 **submit** 18:5 submitted 39:14, 43:15, 44:1 submitting 47:12 substantial 24:2, 28:18, 37:10, 38:2, 38:6, 38:19, 49:13 substantially 30:15, 30:24. 32:5, 37:1 substituted 44:15 substitution 28:10 **SUCCESS** 8:2, 12:8 successful 15:6, 32:3, 36:25, 46:16 successfulness 14:4 **suffice** 48:16 sufficient 32:8, 46:20 suit 24:11 suits 24:5, 24:7, 24:18 sum 7:4, 9:8, 10:25 superimpose 7:17 support 5:3, 20:13, 27:17, 40:23, 47:6 supported 5:21 supporting 18:7 supports 33:13 supposed 47:21, 47:22 Supreme 26:1, 43:16 **surely 14:5** surplus 8:15, 37:22, 38:2, 38:14, 38:16, 39:6, 46:17 surprised 8:5 susceptible 31:13 sustain 29:9 sustained 45:22 **system** 6:18

<T>
table 13:4, 18:11

tail 47:12

tax 15:1, 18:22, 19:2, 19:7, 26:23

Technology 2:15, 3:6, 5:1, 2:9, 25:7, 25:19, 27:17

tells 23:15, 26:18

tempo 31:22

temporary 33:23, 36:3, 36:5

ten 37:8, 37:18

tensions 6:17, 6:23

term 9:24

terminated 29:4, 30:5 termination 31:14, 31:21 terms 6:1, 9:14, 32:19, 34:12. 37:23, 44:16, 45:9, 46:1, 46:20, 47:4, 47:11, 47:24 test 10:14, 43:17 theories 46:17 thereafter 10:2 They've 27:24, 30:2 third 9:11, 22:19, 22:21, 22:22 thirteen 12:5 thirty-six 13:15 though 24:3, 26:4 three 15:5, 33:22, 38:11 throughout 36:7 timeliness 41:11 timely 39:9, 39:17 Today 6:9, 6:24, 8:12, 8:13, 14:9, 17:7, 24:21, 39:14, 44:10, 45:2 Together 7:5, 12:2 top 29:17, 30:10, 30:23 total 32:1 Transcribed 2:24 transcript 51:3 Transcription 51:12 transpired 22:12 Trial 2:20, 25:16, 26:1 tries 25:17 true 11:13, 22:18, 41:3, 51:4 **Trustees 32:23, 45:13** trying 16:14, 22:25, 23:5 turn 22:5, 37:20 twelve 41:18 twenty 19:19 twenty-six 28:17 twenty-three 14:12 twice 6:24, 33:2 two 5:25, 11:1, 13:1, 15:22, 22:23, 23:17, 25:5, 35:7, 41:9, 41:19, 41:22, 44:23, 45:2, 45:7, 45:20 two-fold 31:7 two-thirds 43:12 typically 7:20, 8:4

Wantagh 2:12
wanted .11:6, 20:15, 26:5, 42:18
wants 20:10, 35:5
warrant 14:17
warrants 36:23
weakness 47:10
week 15:9
weighed 26:7
Weinberg 2:16, 4:25

< W >

walks 31:5

Walter 21:20

26:16, 37:23, 38:1, 49:14 underlying 6:12, 27:19, 44:17 understand 9:21, 16:23, 32:18 understanding 39:12, 46:5 unemployment 36:5 unfair 49:24 unfortunate 49:3 United 1:1, 2:21, 5:10, 44:7 unless 25:4, 33:25, 34:5 unsecured 7:14, 10:8, 10:20. 10:24, 11:5, 11:13, 15:14, 15:20, 17:17, 17:24, 23:25, 39:5, 42:11, 46:4 until 14:20, 15:7, 18:23, 29:16, 29:24, 30:4, 49:14 unusual 7:16 upheld 18:13 using 40:13, 40:16

< V > vacated 13:20, 28:19 vacating 33:13 vacuous 18:21 value 9:16, 35:6 valued 11:25, 12:1 variety 37:12 various 40:22 vehemently 35:10 versus 9:18, 26:8 viable 15:6, 32:8 view 36:10 virtually 18:6 virtue 7:12 volunteer 38:5

whack 41:24 whatever 9:13, 39:16 whatsoever 31:25 whence 41:18 whereas 17:18 wherein 9:18 Whereupon 50-4 whether 6:14, 9:2, 16:16, 18:12, 20:22, 43:17, 44:11, 44:20, 45:4, 45:5, 45:17. 46:15, 49:6 whom 31:15 wildly 30:2 will 7:7, 8:25, 9:1, 9:12, 9:14, 10:9, 18:12, 18:13, 23:19, 23:21, 23:24, 24:1, 25:25, 26:3, 29:22, 29:23, 30:14, 30:15, 31:23, 32:3, 32:4, 32:5, 36:11, 38:2, 38:14, 38:15, 38:22, 38:23, 39:14, 39:15, 39:16, 41:15, 47:8, 49:11 willing 47:20, 47:24, 47:25 win 14:10, 21:3, 47:8 windfalls 6:21 wins 28:21, 31:3, 31:4 wish 11:17, 20:4, 27:10, 32:11, 44:4 within 24:15 without 25:3, 36:14 won 20:24 words 39:10 work 6:17, 9:17, 23:5, 36:6 worth 12:8, 14:23, 33:20, 42:24 **written 47:13** wrongdoers 6:21

35:15, 35:18, 35:20

Y > year 8:9, 10:1, 15:4, 26:25, 37:8, 48:17
years 5:15, 5:19, 6:25, 12:5, 14:12, 15:5, 17:19, 18:24, 19:2, 19:19, 21:22, 24:20, 26:2, 26:18, 26:24, 27:22, 28:17, 29:17, 30:5, 36:8, 37:18, 38:9, 38:12, 38:20, 38:21, 41:19, 46:10, 50:3
York 1:2, 1:14, 2:5, 2:17, 2:22,

 Ultimate 37:14, 40:7
 Weinberg 2:16, 4:25

 Ultimately 5:21, 5:24, 8:13,
 WENGER 27:11, 27:15, 28:25,

< U >

15:25, 51:14 yourself 27:13, 34:6, 37:5 yourselves 4:8 <Z> zero 34:25 zero. 22:20 **zeroed** 25:5